

THE *Nation*

AMERICA'S LEADING LIBERAL WEEKLY SINCE 1865

VOLUME 152

NEW YORK · SATURDAY · JUNE 28, 1941

NUMBER 26

IN · THIS · ISSUE

THE SHAPE OF THINGS

737

EDITORIALS

We Have But One Aim *by Freda Kirchwey*

740

The Tax Fiasco

741

The Guild—a Case Study

742

ARTICLES

Hitler Marches East *by Louis Fischer*

743

The Chance of the West *by Norman Angell*

744

The Worker and Defense *by Philip Murray*

745

Geopolitics, East and West *by Peter Stevens*

747

What's Wrong with Our Army?

by Donald W. Mitchell

750

Everybody's Business *by Keith Hutchison*

752

In the Wind

753

A Native at Large *by Jonathan Daniels*

754

BOOKS AND THE ARTS

Notes by the Way *by Margaret Marshall*

755

A Call to Action *by Herbert Rosinski*

755

Eros and Agape *by W. H. Auden*

756

Norman Thomas's Odyssey *by Rose M. Stein*

758

Elizabeth Madox Roberts *by Dorothy Van Doren*

758

Fighting Editor *by James Orrick*

760

In Brief

761

Records *by B. H. Haggin*

762

LETTERS TO THE EDITORS

763

Editor and Publisher

FREDA KIRCHWEY

Managing Editor
ROBERT BENDINER

Washington Editor

I. F. STONE

Literary Editor

MARGARET MARSHALL

Associate Editors

KEITH HUTCHISON

MAXWELL S. STEWART

Dramatic Critic

JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH

Business Manager and Director of Circulation

HUGO VAN ARX

Advertising Manager

MARY HOWARD ELLISON

The Shape of Things

THE NAZI ONSLAUGHT ON RUSSIA IS ONLY three days old as we write, and it is much too early to assess its prospects. Moreover, we must expect even less reliable information about the course of this campaign than we have received from other battlefields of World War II. Both sides are in a position to control completely the flow of information to the outside world, both have long experience in the arts of censorship, and both habitually subordinate truth to propaganda. Up to date it appears that the Germans have penetrated the Russian border at a number of points but not to any great depth. They are still a long way from the main Soviet defense lines, which cover the border as it existed prior to 1939. But the chief Nazi effort at the opening of the campaign is, as in Poland, directed against the air force and communications system of the enemy. The Luftwaffe is roaming over wide areas of western Russia, smashing at railroads and bridges in an effort to hinder Russian mobilization but concentrating its heaviest attacks on airports. It claims to have destroyed huge numbers of Soviet planes and is obviously seeking to establish undisputed mastery of the air so as to pave the way for the mechanized ground forces. It is generally agreed that Hitler cannot afford a lengthy campaign in Russia. Within three months at the most he must achieve his main objectives, the Ukraine—which is not only Russia's granary but its greatest industrial area—and the Caucasus, which besides its importance as a source of oil supplies offers enormous strategic possibilities for a gigantic flanking movement against the whole British position in the Middle East.

✱

THE FIGHTING QUALITY OF THE RED ARMY is the great x in this new extension of the war. Hitler clearly is gambling on the belief that it is formidable only in numbers, and there is all too much reason to fear that this supposition is correct. Most, though not all, independent experts rate Russia's military power as far inferior to Germany's. Its planes and mechanized equipment are generally thought to be of comparatively poor quality, and it is not believed to possess the kind of repair organization which is essential for modern mechanized

warfare. Russia is also likely to suffer from its inferior and inadequate transport system, which may prove as much the Achilles heel of its defense as it has of its economic development. Finally, there is the question of how far the purges of the past few years have affected the morale of the Red Army. In the face of invasion by a hated enemy this may prove higher than foreign observers have estimated, and it must be remembered that in many ways the Russian soldier has been the most favored member of the Soviet community.

✱

RUSSIA HAS ACCEPTED BRITAIN'S PROMPT offer of assistance, but in view of the difficulty of communications the rendering of direct aid is hardly possible. However, the smashing aerial offensive which the R. A. F. has developed against western Germany and the invasion coast is likely to prove invaluable as a check on Hitler's drive east. If the present pace is maintained, Göring may be compelled before very long to pull part of his air fleet away from the eastern frontier. The fact that the Luftwaffe is not capable of sustaining full operation on both fronts provides the British with a grand opportunity. We can help them make the best of it by sending them immediately every available bomber.

✱

THE NAZI-SOVIET WAR PLACES JAPAN IN AN awkward position. Last week the Japanese government was forced to acknowledge failure in its effort to extend the New Order in Asia to the Dutch East Indies by process of intimidation. This presumably led to a temporary shelving of the military's grandiose plans for expansion into the South Seas. Now Japan is forced to decide whether to live up to its obligations to the Axis in a war, not with the United States as it had expected, but with the Soviet Union, with which it has recently signed a neutrality pact. At first sight, the German attack on Russia might seem to give Japan a golden opportunity to invade Siberia—an opportunity its militarists have long awaited. But the immediate risks of such an adventure appear to be even greater than those of a war with the United States. For despite the war in Europe, the Soviet Union is known to have a strong force in eastern Siberia. And Japan's chief cities lie only a few hundred miles from the Soviet air bases near Vladivostok. Furthermore, there is more than a little chance that the United States may yet come into the war, and thereby force Japan to fight simultaneously on two fronts.

✱

IT IS STILL NOT CLEAR WHAT ACTION, IF any, Japan will take. The special conference called by the Emperor to consider Japanese policy in the new crisis has been twice postponed. Judging by Japan's record in the last few months, we may expect a policy of extreme

caution. A shattering Soviet defeat would, of course, be followed by an attack on Siberia, just as an invasion of Britain would be followed by a general Japanese attack on British and Dutch possessions in the South Seas. But barring a sudden overwhelming Nazi victory, Japan will probably ignore its commitment to the Axis. The chief danger is that it may interpret the recent swing toward appeasement in Washington as an indication that the way is now clear for a drive to the south. The Administration has laid itself open to such misinterpretation by passing over Japan in its recent orders against Axis consulates. It seems more likely, however, that Japan will take advantage of the world's preoccupation to push its lagging campaign in China. The Chinese Quisling, Wang Ching-wei, has just made a visit to Tokyo, where he spoke of his hope of aligning China with the Axis. This, of course, presupposes a victory over Chiang Kai-shek, which cannot be achieved if the United States does its part.

✱

CHINA IS IN DANGER OF FALLING VICTIM TO the Nazi-Soviet war. While no country is likely to change its policy toward Chungking because of this new war, the Soviet Union will hardly be able to keep up its aid on anything like the scale of the last four years. The prospect is particularly alarming since American shipments also have been running behind those of last year. Moreover, the overland route from the Soviet Union to China, although difficult, is much the best one for getting supplies into China. Recent reports indicate that traffic on the Burma road has seriously bogged down despite the appointment of an American to supervise it. Although alternative routes are being built, none are yet completed. Since Japan is likely to take advantage of the Nazi-Soviet conflict to push its invasion of China, it is up to the United States to take exceptional measures to give China substantial military assistance of the type formerly provided by the Soviets. This means supplying not only planes but pilots and technicians. And since the amount of aid that it is possible to send to China is limited by transport difficulties, the necessity for stopping aid to Japan has become greater than ever. In addition to stopping shipments of war materials, immediate action should be taken to freeze Japanese funds in this country.

✱

THE RESPONSE OF BOTH CONGRESS AND THE country to the President's message on the Robin Moor sinking was somewhat apathetic. Perhaps this was partly due to the fact that the message contained no program of positive action. It served a useful purpose, however, by placing the question of the Robin Moor in its true perspective. The torpedoing of this American vessel without any provision being made for the safety of its passengers and crew is far more than a mere incident which can be settled by apology and indemnity. As Mr.

Roosevelt said, "We must take it that notice has now been served upon us that no American ship or cargo on any of the seven seas can consider itself safe from acts of piracy." Unable to prevent the passage of the Lend-Lease Act, Germany is now resorting to violence and intimidation in an attempt to render that measured decision of the American people ineffective. The sinking of the Robin Moor underlined threats previously uttered by Admiral Räder and by Hitler himself. To yield to these threats would mean recognizing the waters of the whole world as a combat zone and withdrawing our merchant marine from commerce with every land controlled by Britain and its allies. To take a concrete example, we should have to send out in ballast the ships employed to carry rubber and tin from the East Indies. But as the President said: "We are not yielding and we do not propose to yield." What then? Are we to continue to risk our ships and our sailors' lives by sending them to sea unprotected, or are we to take positive action against the pirates who endanger them? The Administration's next step will undoubtedly be to dispatch a stiff note to Berlin, where its complete rejection is already foreshadowed. In this event there does not seem to be any alternative to providing armed protection for our ships.

★

THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE WORKERS, WHO have just won a contract with the Ford Motor Company covering 130,000 employees in plants all over the country and including the check-off, must feel a little like Joshua when the walls came tumbling down. To be sure, they had won the election in River Rouge by a large majority, but it was generally felt that this was only the first step on a long road toward genuine collective bargaining, which would be obstructed at every turn by Harry Bennett and the Ford lawyers. Instead, Harry Bennett himself signed the momentous document. There are those who see in Ford's all-out gesture in giving the union more than it asked for an attempt to embarrass it by presenting it with what is truly a huge responsibility; and certainly the contract will require careful and intelligent handling. It is suggested also that the agreement to pay a wage equal to the highest in the industry may be a source of confusion and difficulty for the union. But the U. A. W. has gone through its growing pains. What is more, it has pretty well eliminated Communist Party influence, which might be a source of dangerous wild-cat moves, and the contract will greatly strengthen the anti-Communist forces at the forthcoming U. A. W. convention, where the Stalinists are expected to stage an attempt at a comeback. Ford may have been motivated by a desire to give the union more than it could handle; on the other hand, his gesture is not uncharacteristic of a man who does nothing by halves, whether it be fighting a union or accepting it. Moreover, he has gained an end of the hearings of the National Labor Relations Board,

with their devastating evidence of the Ford Company's brutal ways with labor, and the settlement of a number of court cases which would have been equally damaging. This serves to remind us that the peaceful solution represents a triumph not only for the U. A. W. but for the NLRB. The very statistical record of the claims, hearings, testimony, and decisions bears eloquent testimony that if the fight for union recognition by the Ford Company had been conducted without benefit of the Labor Board, it would have left in its wake a trail of disturbance, production delays, and even bloodshed.

★

THE GOVERNMENT OF PETAIN HAS BEATEN its own record of submission to its Nazi masters by agreeing to hand over to Hitler the 100,000 Spanish refugees who found asylum in France after the fascist victory in Spain. Until now the Vichy administration had limited itself to the delivery of such prominent individual Loyalists as Companys and Zugazagoitia, who were arrested in France by the Gestapo, sent back to Spain, and executed by Franco. Now the Pétain government has changed its tactics, and instead of making Franco the present of a few Loyalist lives, it performs the far greater service to the Axis of handing over an army of 100,000 Spanish workers. These men, according to press dispatches, are to be transported to North Africa "to join the huge conscript labor force being marshaled there *under Nazi direction* for work on the strategic Trans-Sahara Railway to Dakar." The first contingent, numbering 7,000, has already sailed for Algeria. In the last four months Hitler has poured into French North Africa great numbers of technicians and engineers. Now he needs a mass of slave labor to accomplish the task of building the strategic road for the next Nazi drive in the Mediterranean. The Spanish refugees serve his needs exactly, at the same time relieving Vichy of an unwelcome body of irreconcilable anti-fascists. In last week's *Nation* Carlo a Prato exposed in detail the subordination of the Vichy police to the Gestapo. The delivery of 100,000 Spanish Republicans offers impressive documentation of the total subservience of Vichy.

★

SENATOR PAT HARRISON WAS ONE OF THE vivid personalities of the Senate. No one who ever met him will forget his humor and unfailing good nature, or underrate his political ability. Although he was by no means a liberal, his record was well above the average. In his labor policies he was usually reactionary, as a Senator from Mississippi might be expected to be, but he worked closely with the Administration in steering the NRA, the AAA, the Social Security Act, and other reform legislation through Congress. As head of the Finance Committee he was instrumental in getting the undistributed-profits tax on the statute book, but he later worked for its repeal. As a member of the Foreign Re-

lations Committee he strongly supported the President's foreign policy. In recent years Pat Harrison had lost much of his buoyancy and had become increasingly conservative, particularly in fiscal policies. But he will be remembered not so much for his recent lapses as for his years of useful service.

We Have But One Aim

BY FRED A KIRCHWEY

HITLER wants oil and wheat and minerals. But he has other desires, too, as Louis Fischer and Norman Angell point out. Some are military; others are political, and his political desires extend far beyond the line of men and equipment stretched from Petsamo to Odessa. They extend to Tokyo and Madrid and Washington and Buenos Aires. They reach into country homes in England and farm houses in Wisconsin. Hitler wants Russia's rich stores of food and materials; he wants them quickly and surely before American aid to Britain robs him of his last hope of early victory, before British bombs further damage Germany's embarkation ports and its morale. But, just as seriously, he wants confusion of mind and conflict of interest among his adversaries and the remaining neutrals. The attack on the Soviet Union is a straight military campaign waged for great stakes. It is also a battle in the world war of nerves.

The United States is the most important objective in this battle, because it is our growing intervention which has informed Hitler that the war will be a long one, longer perhaps than he can afford. His mechanized legions are hurled at American opinion as much as at the Red Army. They carry a variety of suggestions and warnings. They hint to the isolationists that the war is less than ever "our war." They tell the appeasers that further aid to Britain means support of Stalin—and Communist revolution in Europe. They offer hope of a "respite" for England, during which, no doubt, the right people can promote the idea of the right sort of peace. They threaten the independent, anti-fascist left of all countries with the unhappy prospect of a new alliance with the Communists as the price of continued anti-Nazi action. By all these means the Germans hope to build up the opposition to our government's policy of resistance and throw confusion into the ranks of its supporters.

But this strategy will fail. Surely if slowly the American people are coming to understand the one actual issue in this war. It is not an issue which can be blurred by the ideological backtracking of the Communists or the past mistakes and treacheries of the Soviet government. Hitler must be defeated and destroyed, not because yesterday he was in league with Stalin or because he is fighting Stalin today, but because he represents the one overwhelming menace to the Western democracies and to freedom

throughout the world. This most Americans realize. They can be confused by Hitler's march on Moscow only if the nation's leaders allow the policy of the United States to falter or shift.

The answer of Washington to Berlin must be unequivocal. It must echo Winston Churchill's magnificent pledge in his address on the day the invasion of Russia began:

We have but one aim, and one single irrevocable purpose. We are resolved to destroy Hitler and every vestige of his Nazi regime; from this nothing will turn us—nothing. We will never parley, we will never negotiate with Hitler or any of his men. We shall fight him by land, we shall fight him by sea, we shall fight him in the air, until, with God's help, we have rid the earth of his shadow and liberated his peoples from the yoke.

Any man or state who fights against Nazidom will have our aid. Any man or state who marches with Hitler is our foe. This applies not only to organized states but to all representatives of that vile race of Quislings who make themselves the tools and agents of the Nazi regime against their fellow-countrymen and against the land of their birth. These Quislings, like the Nazi leaders themselves, if not disposed of by their fellow-countrymen, which would save trouble, will be delivered by us on the morrow of victory to the justice of the Allied tribunals.

That is our policy and that is our declaration. It follows, therefore, that we shall give whatever help we can to Russia and to the Russian people.

The President need only translate those words into terms of American action and he will wash the minds of the people clear of any Nazi-made distortions. The statement of Sumner Welles was an encouraging, if not an inspired, formulation of the Administration's position.

But a policy is easier to proclaim than to carry out. So far the United States has neither produced nor delivered more than a fraction of the war material Britain urgently needs. Transportation facilities to Russia and within that country are inadequate. Even if the Lease-Lend Act is applied to the Soviet Union, the existence of a declared war means that goods cannot be shipped in American bottoms; and what ships of any registry are available for a greatly increased flow of war supplies? Planes can doubtless be flown to western Russia via Alaska and Siberia, but it is a long and hazardous route. The total amount of help that can be safely delivered on the vast front facing Hitler's mechanized legions is clearly limited. But what can be sent should be sent quickly.

It is equally clear that aid to Britain must be multiplied. No momentary slackening in Hitler's attack should be used as an excuse to slow down American production or divert supplies even to our own defense needs. This is Britain's hour to strike. If Russia holds firm or falls back slowly and at serious cost to the Nazis, Britain may be able to wreck Hitler's last hope of an invasion. The

R. A. F. attacks on Germany's bases and industrial centers, already intensified in the weeks of Hitler's preparation for his drive to the East, can be carried on with even greater effect while the German invasion of Russia continues.

Whatever the outcome of the invasion, Britain's labor of destruction will not be lost. This is the crucial hour, and not one second of it should be wasted. The need of decisive action is so pressing that the United States should send over more than its quota of new planes. We should defer our own needs and transfer our bombers and fighters to the very limits of military safety. We can build more planes; we can never bring back this opportunity for decisive action.

But more important, even, than a defensive support of Britain's position is a strong offensive, in which the United States must also play a major role.

In this offensive every weapon, military and political, should be used. For the moment at least, not only England but the whole non-Nazi world outside of Russia is relatively secure. This is the time for the anti-Nazi forces to seize the initiative, to take aggressive action in North Africa and throughout the Middle East. This is the time to rally anti-Vichy sentiment in France, to crystallize anti-Nazi sentiment in the Mediterranean countries. The fact that Russia is at last in the war and on the side of Britain will have good, as well as troublesome, moral effects. Many reluctant, semi-pacifist elements of the left have watched the struggle with suspicion. These elements are important in France, occupied and unoccupied. They helped France lose its own war with Hitler; given hope of a democratic victory, they may help win the larger war which Hitler's attack on the Soviet Union has initiated.

A powerful offensive launched by Britain in Libya, a final victory in Syria, a strong defense of the other chief strategic positions in the eastern Mediterranean, would stimulate the hopes of millions of workers in France and every captive country. To this mighty effort the United States must contribute all possible aid through speeding up production and extending the range and activity of our sea patrol. And surely we should delay no longer in removing the obstacles provided by the obsolete Neutrality Law.

The war between Russia and Germany will be a source of confusion only if the leaders of opinion in the democracies allow it to be. Winston Churchill has indicated that he understands the full meaning of the issues involved. Sumner Welles, with less vigor and inspiration, has formulated clearly the American position. The danger in this country is that our leaders, too sensitive to the general distrust of communism and of the Soviet Union, will move slowly, waiting for the popular reaction. But this is no time to sit holding the public pulse. Russia's war is democracy's opportunity, perhaps its last one for a long time to come.

The Tax Fiasco

THE chance that an adequate tax program will emerge from the House Ways and Means Committee has now largely vanished. After more than two months of hearings and discussion, the committee has chosen to throw most of the constructive features of the Treasury plan out the window and has adopted few of the improvements suggested by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation or Chairman Eccles of the Federal Reserve Board. The results are far from satisfactory. There is no longer any hope of attaining the Treasury's original objective of defraying two-thirds of the government's expenditures for 1941-42 by taxation and restricting borrowing to cover the remaining third. The best that is anticipated is that about 12 or 13 billion dollars will be raised in taxes and borrowing held to 10 or 12 billion. The final outcome is much more likely to be a fifty-fifty distribution between taxes and loans rather than the hoped-for distribution of two to one.

But this is not the worst of it. By adopting an increase in the tax rate on moderate incomes only about one-half as steep as the Treasury proposal, the House committee will have to fall back on excise taxes for a large part of the needed revenue. These taxes, which will be paid mainly by low-income groups, will be put into effect immediately, whereas the boost in personal and corporation income taxes will not actually become payable until next March 15. Elimination of separate income-tax returns by husband and wife is the only constructive action taken by the committee thus far.

Especially unfortunate was the House Ways and Means Committee's rejection of the Treasury's proposal for strengthening the excess-profits tax. The present tax, as the Treasury points out, is not really a levy on excess profits but on war profits. It allows a corporation to earn as much as 50 or 60 per cent on its invested capital without paying this tax provided it made such earnings in the four-year base period. The invested-capital formula offers the only way in which the principle of ability to pay can be applied to corporations. The present policy, retained by the committee, of allowing corporations to choose between the invested-capital and the average-earnings principle has been found in practice to leave altogether too many loopholes for companies with huge earnings. The tax hearings showed big business almost unanimously opposed to the Treasury proposals. That should have given the committee a hint of their relative effectiveness.

It should be frankly recognized that the greater part of the testimony before the committee, except that by government officials, represented efforts on the part of the "haves" to shift the burden of defense taxation to the "have-nots." The "haves" are highly organized. They can afford expensive legal talent to explain the injustice

of any tax which falls on the well-to-do. But the President has announced that it is the Administration's policy to see that the emergency taxes are imposed, as far as possible, on the basis of ability to pay. So far the Ways and Means Committee has yielded to the pressure of entrenched interests on every important issue. In so doing it has virtually repudiated the President's leadership. We believe, however, that the President has the prestige and the power to gain the support of a majority of members of Congress if he chooses to make a fight on this issue. And since the nature of our post-war society depends largely on how the defense program is financed, it is an issue on which he must take a stand. This is no time to allow corporation spokesmen to write our tax laws.

The Guild—a Case Study

THE general assembly of the Newspaper Guild of New York of June 19 was notable for two things. It reversed, by a vote of 365 to 362, the action of the previous meeting supporting the Inglewood strike, although that strike had been disavowed by the national leadership of both the United Automobile Workers and the C. I. O. And it showed pretty clearly the actual numerical strength of the Stalinist minority, which at present dominates the New York local, to be less than 400 out of a total membership of a little more than 4,000. To be sure, the administration slate of delegates for the Guild's national convention won in the recent election by a ratio of seven to five, with 1,600 not voting. But that contest involved various issues, factional and other, whereas the Inglewood strike posed only one question: whether or not the Guild should support a stoppage which Philip Murray himself had labeled an outlaw strike precipitated by Communists in the automobile workers' union and designed to hinder the defense program. There is no question that the Guild administration mustered every bit of its membership strength in order to prevent a reversal of the stand taken a week before at a meeting attended by some 200 people. That strength turned out to be 362. The opposition likewise tried to muster its strength. Its "meeting" force totaled 365 votes, but in the week between the two meetings 800 members had individually repudiated the support of the wild-cat strike at Inglewood by signing statements circulated in the various units.

This is a typical case study of a union under Stalinist control. That control is based on the ability to command the regular attendance at union meetings of a disciplined one-way minority which is large enough to constitute a majority at most meetings.

The ostensible and easy answer to the question of how this control can be broken is that the majority, if they would fulfil their duty as members as faithfully as the Stalinists do, could very soon, by regular attendance at

meetings, dislodge the minority. And even an oppositionist is likely to argue sadly that since the Stalinists are so assiduous they have a right to set the Guild's policies even though those policies run counter to the actual sentiments of the great majority of its members. But this is a fallacious argument which the Stalinists have exploited.

Certainly the inertia of the majority is reprehensible. But this is not the only factor. Even a good union member, particularly if he is subject to eccentric newspaper hours, cannot always attend meetings; and he cannot always stay until the small hours of the morning, when the Stalinists, who control the machinery, deliberately choose to discuss really important issues, since they know that by then the field has been left to members under their orders. In any case, the failure to attend meetings hardly justifies the penalty of having the union run by a machine of which the driving power is not primarily the desire to build a strong union but to use it as a political tool.

Certainly also, those who do the work in unions should have the honor of being recognized and given official positions. But the fact that they do the work does not entitle them to flout the known will of the membership, as the Guild administration has repeatedly done—especially when their zeal springs from extra-union motives which are fundamentally inimical to its welfare.

The ideal way out of a serious dilemma would be to bring about somehow the constant and overwhelming attendance at every meeting of a majority aware of the issues and determined to have the union run in the interest of the membership, not of an outside political party.

But democratic bodies being what they are, it is difficult to weld the majority, which, unlike the Stalinist minority, has no desire to rule for an outside party's sake, into a disciplined unit. Its members are much more likely to lapse into disgust and indifference. Practically speaking, the only immediate solution probably lies in the building of a counter minority machine, which is not in itself desirable. There is one other hope. The national convention of the Guild, now in session, may oust its present Stalinist leadership. An executive council representing the definitely anti-Communist views of the membership could bring pressure on the New York regime; it might even cite the example of the Teachers' Union in expelling locals under Communist control.

It would be unfortunate if such measures became necessary, but the Inglewood episode demonstrated that the situation in the New York local cannot continue except at the price of serious disruption. It also indicated that the Stalinists are ready to risk even that rather than lose their control. They not only tried to throw out the vote that reversed the Guild's stand on the Inglewood strike by charging fraud, but the leadership attempted later, with surpassing impudence, to construe this reversal into a reaffirmation. Obviously the Communist Party's trade-union policy is "rule or ruin."

Hitler Marches East

BY LOUIS FISCHER

SO THE Nazis have launched a declared war on the Soviet Union. Another negotiated peace has been disrupted by Adolf Hitler. In September, 1938, Chamberlain and Daladier, appeasers and non-interventionists, signed a negotiated peace with Hitler. Eleven months later their countries were at war with Germany. August 23, 1939, was Stalin's Munich; he negotiated a peace with Hitler at the expense of Poland and the Baltic states. Now Stalin is reaping the fruits of that appeasement. It was inevitable; critics of the post-Litvinov policy always predicted it. There is no safety with Hitler. The only way is to destroy him.

I think America's part in the war shaped Russia's fate. The more aid America sent to England the more Hitler had to extract from Russia. That helps to explain why the Communists opposed aid to England. America's jerky progress toward belligerency convinced the Nazis that they could not win the war quickly. They had to prepare, instead, for a long contest with Britain and America. But the territory under Nazi control has never fed itself and cannot support a protracted war. Only the Soviet Union can furnish the required supplies. Hitler, however, wanted more than Russian materials. He wanted to be sure that Moscow would not cut him off in an hour of dire need. He wanted to be sure that if the war lasted a long time, and if Germany were weakened by it, Russia would not stab Germany in the back. To prevent this, Hitler has to break the Soviets militarily and deprive them of their key munitions and raw materials. Hitler's aim today is a Vichified Russia, part occupied, part "free," working for him and maybe even fighting for him.

It is very likely that Hitler decided to attack irrespective of Moscow's attitude. He wished to clean up his Russian problem once and for all and thus consolidate the entire European continent behind him in anticipation of the Anglo-American siege. But if Berlin did make far-reaching demands for goods deliveries and for control inside Russia, it was certainly obvious to Stalin that these demands were merely the beginning of a series, and that today's yielding would leave Russia less capable of resisting tomorrow's pressure.

Hitler was forced to fight the Bolsheviks, however much he might have preferred to concentrate on England. And thus Stalin had to go to war, however much he fears the results of hostilities.

The fate of the Soviet regime is at stake. The outbreak of war between Germany and Russia makes Communist Russia, in effect, the ally of anti-Communist Brit-

ain and America. But Czarist Russia was also the ally of the democracies, and then Czarist Russia collapsed. Russia's history since 1936—which I analyzed in detail in my "Men and Politics"—will now avenge itself upon Bolshevism.

The Soviet-Nazi war is a great stroke of luck for England and America. The British probably intensified their bombing of the Ruhr, western Germany, and occupied France from June 11 on in order to encourage Moscow to stand firm, and President Roosevelt may have had in mind Soviet psychology, among other things, when he sent his stiff anti-Nazi message to Congress on the Robin Moor. If the Baltic states, White Russia, and the Ukraine are quickly overrun, if the Soviet government is forced to capitulate and vast Bolshevik territories are subjected to methodical German economic exploitation, the democracies will have suffered a serious setback, for Hitler will then turn west with augmented confidence and power. But by immediately stepping up their efforts the British and Americans can involve Hitler in a violent two-front war which is the best road to an Allied victory.

In one way, so far as Hitler is concerned, his attack on Russia is late. Earlier, Germany would have been less tormented by British raids. Now, the R. A. F., using new American-made planes, can handicap his *Blitzkrieg* against the Soviets. But Hitler had to delay until he had conquered the Balkans, "coordinated" Vichy, and converted Turkey's alliance with Russia into Turkish neutrality. The advantage for Hitler, however, is that the fields and dirt roads in the Soviet area of combat are now dry, and since there are not even any stone walls, wire fences, or stout houses in the Ukraine or White Russia, Nazi tanks and trucks can move cross-country in straight lines. The Ukraine is as flat as a table. The Ukrainian harvest is still green in the fields. Harvesting takes place at the end of July. If the Ukrainian crop is partially destroyed by incendiary bombs or ground fighting or as a result of inadequate labor and insufficient oil for tractors, combines, and motor transport, Hitler will not care; Germany has enough bread for 1941, and the Nazis are thinking of the Ukrainian rye and wheat of 1942; but it would be a blow to Russia, which without Ukrainian surpluses must go short or immediately begin dipping into meager reserves. In July the population of the city of Moscow depends for bread on the Crimea, which reaps before the Ukraine. But if railway lines are overburdened by the military, the effect will be felt forthwith.

To take Leningrad, the Baltic states, White Russia, the Ukraine, the granary of the northern Caucasus, and the Caucasus proper, Hitler has probably given himself three full months, until the beginning of October, when weather becomes an obstacle. If he succeeds, he will have deprived the Soviet regime of its richest food sources and its most valuable industries. He could thereupon ram a Brest-Litovsk peace down the throat of the Soviet government and direct his fury against Britain once more. As between the German and Soviet armed forces, the German are stronger. How long Russia can hold out will therefore depend on the amount of damage the R. A. F. can inflict on Germany and on how much Nazi air power Churchill compels Hitler to divert westward.

Unfortunately for Stalin, the Finns and Rumanians can say that they are fighting to regain territory he recently stole from them. This will win them sympathy among the other robbed nations of Europe. The Nazis will benefit from that sympathy.

Many allegiances will be divided. Americans have

been friendly to Finland. Now Finland is an ally of our enemy, Hitler. The Communists should, logically, go pro-British and forget the faults of Winston Churchill, who has promised aid to Stalin. Will Japan jump on Siberia? Will America try to stop Japan from doing so? Will Lindbergh, who should now have some doubts about a Nazi victory, therefore intensify agitation which favors the Nazis?

Whatever the answers to these riddles, most Americans will rejoice that Hitler has another enemy. As preliminary to any consideration of American aid to Russia under the Lease-Lend Act, Washington should informally demand that Russia and Britain sign an agreement not to conclude a separate peace with Germany. Russia is a tremendous country, and should the *Blitzkrieg* succeed, the Soviet government could retreat endlessly eastward. It would also make a good impression in this country and England if Maxim Litvinov and Troyanovsky were restored to office and if purged Bolsheviks who are still alive, like Radek, Rakovsky, and some others, were released.

The Chance of the West

BY NORMAN ANGELL

THE Nazi turn against Russia belongs clearly to the order of events which are at once a great peril and a great opportunity. The peril lies in the fact that Hitler may find in this new move one more opportunity for dividing morally those whom he must overcome if his victories so far are to profit him at all. The opportunity lies in the fact that, properly employed, the move may marshal against him the very forces he proposes to use against the rest of the world, or at the very least give time to rally and mobilize the forces potentially so very much greater than his own, and still unconquered by him—the forces of America and the British Empire.

The military strategists point out that in any case there is very little material aid that America could quickly give to Russia, even if it went as part of the aid sent to Britain. But if during the next few weeks Hitler can manage seriously to divide American and British opinion, then certain vital strategic decisions may be so delayed while "waiting for public opinion to develop" that he will be able once more to seize and keep the initiative. It is almost certain that the Hess visit was part of this maneuver.

We—the British and American public—have still inadequately digested the fact that the ultimate explanation of Hitler's victories has been his employment of the "moral" weapon—his capacity to divide the non-Nazi world so that it can be brought under the domination of

a Nazi minority; if the non-Nazi majority had only learned the trick of hanging together as the sole alternative to being hanged separately, this evil menace would not now hang over us.

It is particularly on this matter of Bolshevism versus Nazism that the confusion has from the beginning arisen. Western Europe could not, in fact, make up its mind which of the two evils was the greater; and failed to see that that was never the question. The real question was, not which was the greater evil, but which was the greater danger. "Communist unrest" was something for Western states to meet in part by education, in part by constructive social reform. It was never anywhere in itself a military danger. It was a danger to defense only in so far as it played the game of Nazism by contributing to the divisions from which Nazism, not communism, profited.

The events of the last two years have shown beyond dispute that Nazism was in a position to profit greatly from the weaknesses of Western society—particularly the disruptive nationalism which rendered that society incapable of mutual aid in defense against the domination of a violent and ruthless but competent and cohesive minority. It was this weakness which enabled the Nazi minority to sweep over the world in a devastating wave that threatens to carry away the freedoms built up in a thousand years of toil.

A day or two ago I sat in a gathering of religious,

well-intentioned folk. A man of education and knowledge expressed the view that Britain should have avoided this war at the time of Munich by striking a bargain with Germany which would have allowed Hitler a free hand to attack Russia in return for peace in the West. Very few of the earnest folk present seemed at all shocked by this suggestion. Very few seemed to recall that the proposal represented precisely the intention which those of the left everywhere believed to animate the more sinister elements of the right; and that for governments in Western Europe to have lent themselves to such a maneuver would have split Western nations from top to bottom, would not have preserved peace, and would have delivered the situation into the hands of the Nazis even more completely than events have done so far.

To forestall the confusions which are likely to bedevil counsel and policy in the coming months we must keep constantly before us the first and last purpose of this war against Germany. That purpose, as it affects America, is the defense of the people of this country, as of others, against the oppressions of a counter-revolution similar to that which the people of France now face, a counter revolution which has resulted in part from internal division, in part from external pressure.

Russian communism as we now know it represents an evil form of society. So be it. Are we therefore indiffer-

ent whether Russia is overrun and brought under the domination of the Nazi power? We know that if that takes place Nazi Germany will stretch from the shores of the Bay of Biscay and the North Sea to the shores of the Pacific. Germany, in fact, will in that event be brought to within a dozen miles of American territory. And that conquest, as Churchill reminds us, would be merely the prelude to an all-out assault upon the British fortress. If Britain fell, then the whole world outside of North America would be under the command of Hitler; and no one who can face facts at all would pretend that in such circumstances the United States would be defensible for very long.

Russia, we are told, is not a Christian state. Neither is China. Neither is India. Most of the world is non-Christian. The conquest of Russia by Germany would not make Russia more Christian. It would only make it more dangerous.

To show that the West is prepared to give Russia the same rights of protection against external violence, the same rights to life as a nation and a state, which Western nations demand, will be to increase the chances that ultimately it will, with others, take its part in common resistance to war. The alternative—some form of appeasement which would throw the Soviets to the Nazi wolves—would in the end condemn us all to a like fate.

The Worker and Defense

BY PHILIP MURRAY

THE C. I. O. rejects the view that it is now necessary to curtail consumption drastically in order to carry out our defense program and provide aid to Britain. I am not unmindful of the expanding character of the defense effort or of the now discernible actual and potential shortages in strategic materials, especially certain metals. But I know that there are still in this country several million jobless men and women who could and should be employed to build additional capacity for the production of armaments as well as consumer goods. I know, too, that our present productive facilities are not being utilized to the full.

Those who advocate lowered living standards at this time cling to the discredited notion that our economic welfare requires an economy of scarcity and overlook the fact that the greatest asset of a nation seeking to defend its democratic way of life is a healthy and satisfied people. If all our people are to put forth the energy and give the devotion for which the times call, those on the lower rungs of the economic ladder must have their living standard raised, not lowered; and it is my considered

judgment that this can be done without harm or delay to the defense program. It cannot, however, be done under a "business as usual" arrangement. It calls rather for careful and intelligent planning far beyond anything we have so far undertaken.

Some months ago I proposed a plan for Industry Councils, the fundamental purpose of which was to obtain full and efficient use of all our productive resources. These resources include not only plant facilities and manpower but labor's ability to lend practical aid in production problems, as illustrated by the Reuther and steel-expansion plans submitted by the C. I. O. Management has no monopoly of brains, and the extensive experience of labor could be used most advantageously to advance the defense program and the nation's well-being. Unfortunately, none of these proposals have received the serious consideration which many industrialists and economists, as well as labor men, believe they merit.

Current discussion of the need to reduce outlay on consumer goods rests upon the assumption that increased employment, plus increased wage rates, has already cre-

ated or will soon create purchasing power in excess of available commodities, and that a commodity shortage leads to high prices and consequent inflation. Suggestions for avoiding this unpleasant prospect are running rife, most of them aiming in one way or another to reduce the worker's purchasing power and living standards. The devices proposed range all the way from frozen wage rates to increased taxes and a variety of complex deferred-spending plans.

I am fully cognizant of the dangers inherent in inflation. No group has more to suffer from runaway prices than the working people of America, a very large proportion of whom, even when they are fully employed, receive an income which, despite recent wage boosts, is barely up to a level of health and efficiency. I do not subscribe, however, to the premise that we face now or in the near future a serious shortage of consumer goods. Some goods are going to be scarcer, to be sure. We are going to have fewer automobiles, and a reduced supply of many other mechanical gadgets. But these reductions will not materially lower living standards, nor need they be allowed to become the pivot for a spiral of rising prices. If our price-control agencies function effectively, there is no reason why prices should get out of hand.

The worker will have ample opportunity to spend his wages on commodities which are far more essential to his own and his family's well-being than articles made of steel, aluminum, or nickel, many of which he buys because he is unable to resist high-pressure salesmanship and attractive instalment-plan offers. There are ample reservoirs of consumer goods on which our population can spend its income without interfering with armament production. First of all, it can buy more and better food. Facts brought out at the Nutrition Conference recently held in Washington, the high rate of rejections among draftees because of physical defects, and various health studies made in recent years attest eloquently to the inadequate diet of a large segment of our population. Department of Agriculture experts estimate that if American families had "good" diets, they would consume 15 to 20 per cent more dairy products, 35 per cent more eggs, and from 70 to 100 per cent more fruits and vegetables. We have all these commodities in abundance, and, given sufficient income, our people will buy them. The value of such spending to both consumers and producers hardly needs to be argued.

The inadequacy of medical and dental care among our people, especially in small industrial towns and rural areas, is a disgrace of long standing. We may run short of facilities for building much-needed hospitals and clinics, but there is as yet no shortage of doctors and dentists. Some small effort directed toward organizing health cooperatives would help to divert some of the national income to keeping the nation's health intact, and incidentally help some of the less prosperous members

of the medical and dental professions to earn a livelihood commensurate with their long preparation for these important and socially useful careers.

There is need for wholesome recreation. A population hard at work needs adequate facilities for spending its leisure time to the best advantage. Too great strain and fatigue, and the hazards of accident and ill health attendant upon them, must be avoided. Periodic vacations open up a channel for spending which instead of interfering with defense production would make it more efficient.

The point I wish to make is that we do not need to curtail consumption; we need only to *redirect* it. This calls for intelligent community planning, in which organized labor is always ready and willing to lend a hand. Much of the redirection will take place automatically. On the basis of usual spending patterns, our economists estimate that nearly 80 per cent of the \$500,000,000 annual wage increase recently obtained by the C. I. O. for its members will be spent on food, clothing, housing, medical care, and general household operations. With a reasonable amount of redirected consumption, there will be no need for deferred spending schemes. I know the American workers. They are loyal and thrifty. Those whose income is above the level essential for modest but decent living will save without compulsion. And they will gladly invest in securities offered by Uncle Sam.

I know, of course, that proposed taxation and deferred-spending plans have at least two other objectives in view—to pay for the defense program and to provide a backlog of purchasing power against a possible post-war depression. As to the first, the only just and democratic principle of taxation is that based on ability to pay. I have no objection to workers paying an income tax, provided their incomes are high enough to enable them to maintain a living standard commensurate with our national resources. But no tax structure is adequate or fair which, as the President said, allows the rich to get richer and the poor to get poorer. I am most emphatically opposed to a sales tax.

The kind of backlog for post-war buying which can be built up through deferred spending will be insufficient to save us from depression if we revert to the anarchy which ruled at the close of the last war, and will be unnecessary if we plan for comprehensive economic adjustments. Assuming we can force our people to deprive themselves of the necessities of life to the extent of, say, \$4 billion a year, assuming further that the emergency will be over by 1945, between \$16 billion and \$20 billion will have been accumulated. Repayment of these savings will depend upon Congressional action. Congress may decide not to pay them at all, in which case the whole scheme will topple like a house of cards. If it chooses to pay them back over a period of years, the net effect of the annual payments will be too small to check deflation and depression. If, however, Congress

decides to pay them back in a lump sum, at a time when our national debt will already be the highest in history, it can do so only by levying new taxes. If these are levied on the poor, money taken out of one pocket will be put into another. If the taxes are to be levied on those able to pay, why not do it now, when profits are at their peak?

We shall find ample use for our expanded productive capacity at the end of the emergency in building homes and roads, replenishing the supply of automobiles and other heavy consumer goods, helping feed and rebuild war-torn Europe, and aiding in the development of Latin America. A vast market for goods and services will exist among our own people if only they are allowed a fair share of the wealth they produce. This depends, of course, on a more equitable distribution of the national income, which can be brought about through collective bargaining, an intelligent tax structure, and enforcement of the anti-monopoly laws. Beside these potential outlets the demand created by currently deferred spending would be practically nil.

We must never lose sight of the fact that the "four freedoms" we are all determined to preserve include economic freedom. This freedom is limited as long as millions remain unemployed. It will be in grave jeopardy if we show any readiness to surrender without a struggle the minimum living standards of our people. I am convinced that such surrender is not necessary and that it would offer a greater threat to the democratic cause than any other possible development within or without. No mental gymnastics can build a sound case for cutting down consumption as long as there is an unused labor supply to produce more goods. With full utilization of available labor, with proper redirection of consumer demand, with the application to constructive ends of the intelligence God gave us, we can keep our people well fed, well clad, in time well housed, and at the same time produce the arms we need to defend ourselves and those who, like ourselves, seek to retain the decencies and freedoms which the human race has striven for through the centuries.

Geopolitics, East and West

BY PETER STEVENS

TO AN American just returned from the war and near-war zones of Southeastern Europe and Southwestern Asia the pattern of talk and events here is deeply shocking. It is shocking because it is so reminiscent of what went on in all the European countries now occupied by the Germans and in the countries of the Middle East which are awaiting Nazi "deliverance" from imperialistic, plutocratic British "tyranny."

I have watched the plans of the German Geopolitical Institute* executed step by step by Himmler's Gestapo and Goebbels's propaganda machine in eight countries—Hungary, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Greece, Syria, Palestine, and Iraq. Only in Turkey have I seen them thwarted by a vigilant and shrewd government which has dealt ruthlessly with every attempt to set the geopolitical machinery running. Other eyewitnesses have described how Western European states were paralyzed by the softening-up process used by the Nazis prior to actual occupation. In all, seventeen countries have succumbed to the Nazi "strategy of terror," discovering too late that Hitler's methods of political warfare cannot be countered with orthodox kid gloves. Yet so cleverly and gradually is the Nazi virus injected that we have not yet fully recognized the unmistakable infection in our own body politic. It may be useful, therefore, to sketch the general

pattern of the German technique as I have observed it in action and to illustrate its effects with incidents from my own experience in the conquered countries. To this pattern and these examples the parallels here are all too obvious.

The spearhead of the Nazi method is the construction of what may be called a front of malcontents. This must be led by a respectable group who can be put on display to reassure the public. Confused idealists, uninformed pacifists, ex-heroes, sincere leaders of dead causes are required to provide an innocent window-dressing. The rank and file of the malcontents' front is made up of Russophile Communists, Jew-baiters, anti-Catholic bigots, reactionary bankers and manufacturers, discredited political groups, personally ambitious rabble-rousers, irredentists, and the diehard flotsam of lost causes which litters the political sea of every democratic country. For ammunition old grudges, blind prejudices, and long-abandoned issues are exhumed and polished up. Each group in this front is promised everything it has ever wanted; each group is assured separately and confidentially that they will be "top men" and that their cause will prevail when the wave of the future rolls in.

Certain key men not in any of these groups are often bought outright. There is good reason to believe that Horia Sima in Rumania, Mihailov in Bulgaria, the Koualty leaders in Syria, and Rashid Ali in Iraq were

* The Institute is described by Frederick Sondern in the June issue of *Current History* in an article entitled *The Thousand Scientists Behind Hitler*.

won over in this way. In Bagdad in April I was told that Rashid Ali's price was \$100,000 in a Swiss bank, also available at the Imperial Bank of Iran, plus a European mistress and a new Mercedes-Benz, both carrying a trade-in guaranty.

Though it may be hard for our well-meaning fellow-travelers who consider themselves merely liberals to believe it, the Communists in every Balkan country cooperated fully with the German organizations and the local malcontents' front in preparing for the capitulation. A former Prime Minister of Bulgaria, the leader of the largest liberal leftist party in the country, said to me in January, "Any hope of a popular-front, left-of-center opposition to German occupation is gone, since our strongest and best-organized group, the Communists, are firmly in the camp of the Germans in the spirit of the Berlin-Moscow agreement." A few self-respecting Communists did form an anti-Russian Communist group, but it was pitifully small.

As soon as the German diplomatic corps and the advance Gestapo men report this front of malcontents as an established fact, the Goebbels machinery goes into high gear. One or more newspapers are bought outright or subsidized. Illustrated magazines somewhat like *Life* are printed in Berlin and distributed free in great quantities. The D. N. B., on the German radio, appeals to the population through every receiving set, and the propaganda power of the German radio is incomparably greater than that of any other country. Its influence in Iraq may be taken as typical. Every Arab, at least every town or village Arab, spends part of his day in a coffee house. And every coffee house has a powerful outdoor radio which can be heard blocks away. From Tel-Kochek in the north to Basra in the south, one is seldom out of range of their weird music and loud speech. The Germans hired a brilliant rabble-rouser named Younis Bahri at a huge salary and took him to Berlin. He speaks the language of the average Iraqi of the coffee house and has rubbed salt into every old sore disturbing British-Iraqi relations. The B. B. C. from London and Jerusalem counters this with Arabic programs given in the stiff and pedantic classical Arabic, which is almost unintelligible to the common people. An Englishman who has lived in Iraq since the last war told me he believed that 90 per cent of the people who had access to a radio heard Younis Bahri daily, while 15 per cent at the most heard the B. B. C.

Some time before the occupation the Germans had gained control of almost all moving-picture theaters in the Balkans, and pacifist groups were strengthened by the constant stream of German films showing *Blitzkrieg* scenes. These were usually followed on the screen by views of young German Apollos in field-gray tending Polish babies or dressing the wounds of frightening-looking thugs in French or Dutch or Norwegian uni-

forms. Deputies, hesitating politicians, and lukewarm army officers of high rank were wine, dined, and shown these pictures. The obvious implication was, why make these wholesome German boys destroy you when you can have them here as friends simply by a little cooperation?

I heard much whispering about the way the Nazis blackmailed factory owners and other rich men and I finally ran across one case which is probably fairly typical. One would expect that the rich, after listening to what the D. N. B. had to say about plutocrats, would be strongly against the New Order, but a great proportion of them turned up, at least apparently, in the Nazi camp. Since he is alive and still in Sofia, we will call my man Gregor Stanev, a name which bears no relation to his own. Likewise we will say he owns a shoe factory. Several times during 1940 a German purchasing agent came to his factory and ordered moderate quantities of shoes at very good prices. In December the agent came again and offered a contract for the entire output of the factory, at good prices, for a period of five years. Stanev was delighted until the agent added with studied casualness, "We expect that your contributions to the Agrarian Party will cease. We further expect that your not inconsiderable influence will be used to facilitate an orderly and peaceful installation of the New Order in Bulgaria. From time to time we may have other small favors to ask along this line which we are sure you will be glad to grant."

Stanev refused to be bought and asked for the contract. It was returned to him, and the agent left, apologetically and with a great show of courtesy. Within a very few days Stanev's eldest son, a young army officer, came home upset and excited. He urged his father to change his mind. He had been approached by a senior officer on behalf of the New Order. This officer had assured him that the factories of those who cooperated would not be confiscated or molested in any way. If Stanev refused, he faced possible loss by confiscation, certain ruin through loss of orders, and in all probability the breakup of his family and a concentration camp. Stanev has a wife and several children in addition to the son who is an army officer. He could not be bought, but this threat to his family and their safety was too much; he signed.

I do not know the end of this particular case. But if other incidents are indicative, the "purchasing agent" probably came back when the German army entered Bulgaria on March 1 in the neat dark gray of the Elite Guard. He is probably now Stanev's partner in the shoe business.

The success of this kind of campaign, based on unrest, disorganization, and threats, depends on the German agility in carrying water on both shoulders—making incompatible promises to incompatible groups—until the Nazis' complete domination makes it no longer necessary


for them to keep any promises. Last winter and fall the Nazis were financing and directing diametrically opposed irredentist groups in Yugoslavia, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Persons opposed to the New Order in these countries begged the English to flood the air waves and propaganda routes with the simple statement that Dobrudja, Macedonia, Bessarabia, Transylvania, Croatia, and other territories were being promised by the Germans to two countries at once. In fact, certain portions of Transylvania were actually being promised to Russia, Hungary, and the Rumanian Iron Guardists at one and the same time. They are now occupied by *German* troops. The English refused on the ground that such propaganda would be interfering in the internal affairs of a friendly country. They were content to bring the matter to the attention of the governments concerned through regular diplomatic channels, ignoring the fact that these governments were in many cases carefully keeping the facts from their people in order to aid the Germans.

Thwarted nationalism provides the happiest hunting ground for the Nazis. This approach has been used very successfully in Croatia, Syria, Palestine, Iraq, and even in India and South Africa. Imperialism and plutocracy are the most successful bogies of propaganda. And the British, whose history has been gone over with a fine-toothed comb for examples of their villainies, are presented as preeminently plutocratic and imperialistic. We fill the next spot of honor as their dupes and assistants. Boer War concentration camps, America's refusal to sell

the Boers guns, and eighteenth-century British atrocities are refurbished and broadcast in sanctimonious terms by the operators of Dachau and the authors of the crimes in Poland.

We are told as the Balkans were told, and as each victim has been told, that we are the exception; that against us there is no claim and no conspiracy. And we, like those helpless millions in Europe, show signs of believing it. Many of us, like many of them, are willing to forget or explain away the very words of the official interpreter and formulator of Nazi ideals and aims, Dr. Rosenberg: "A new peace shall make Germany mistress of the globe, a peace not hanging on the palm fronds of lachrymose pacifist women-folk, but established by the victorious sword of a master-race that takes over the world in the service of a higher civilization."

I do not know whether the forces that march behind the respectable front of Lindbergh and Wheeler and Nye were marshaled by Haushofer's Geopolitical Institute. But they have an amazing similarity to groups used by the Nazis in other countries. There walk the fellow-traveling labor leaders, the Christian Front and the Jew-baiters, Protestant Veterans and Catholic-haters, and an amazing array of professional rabble-rousers and adherents of lost causes. The week that I returned from Europe, the Christian Front held an America First rally in Boston. The entertainment was blitz-horror movies supplied by the German consul. How familiar it all seemed! To me it was plainly the repetition on a colossal scale, as befits America, of the first figures in the pattern



CRIME MARCHES ON

which in seventeen nations in the last few years has led finally to capitulation and the New Order.

Some say that the Bill of Rights gives this movement the "right" to proceed on its fatal course; others that we are so strong and so rich that we need not be troubled by Communist interference with our plans for arming,

that we can afford to ignore the defeatism and pacifism of Lindbergh and Wheeler, and the racial, social, and religious hates of Coughlin and the Christian Front. But let us not forget the similarity of our malcontents' front to the Nazi tools in each and every one of the nations already engulfed by the Wave of the Future.

What's Wrong with Our Army?

BY DONALD W. MITCHELL

THE army has aptly been called the stepchild of American defense. More than any other agency of government it has been the victim of circumstances. During the two decades of peace, military training in the schools and the fascism, real or alleged, of some officers have been favorite targets of pacifists and liberals. Economy-minded Congresses have so reduced the army's appropriations that it has, at times, nearly perished from financial malnutrition. Its personnel, both commissioned and enlisted, has too frequently consisted of the ne'er-do-wells and misfits of civil life, to whom the prospect of a secure if poorly paid existence has beckoned more alluringly than the competition of civilian life.

Today the army suffers from a very different set of circumstances. It has been given more money than it ever expected to receive and masses of recruits whom it was unprepared to assimilate, though the General Staff, without too great an inner struggle, allowed itself to be persuaded to favor conscription. Supplied with unlimited quantities of both money and men, the army has been expected to do only one thing—show results. In some respects its response has been very creditable. Many of the useless activities of military life, such as excessive fatigue duty, overemphasis on the manual of arms, and antiquated forms of etiquette, have been dropped. Rookies clad in sensible uniforms have been given as much instruction as they could possibly absorb in the time allowed. All things considered, the construction of cantonments has progressed satisfactorily. Much necessary new equipment has been provided. In short, the army has shown more energy than many of its critics would formerly have believed possible.

But these isolated accomplishments do not mean that the army has become a powerful modern force capable of meeting German troops and defeating them. The training of a mass of raw recruits results in the temporary weakening of an army, for veteran divisions have to be broken up to form the cadres for the new material. The development of new weapons, particularly anti-aircraft and anti-tank guns, has left the army short of implements for fighting a modern war. No less an authority

than General Marshall has testified to the army's fine spirit, but virtually nothing has been done deliberately to build morale and esprit de corps among the new troops. The Army Air Corps, partly because of the necessity of providing air aid to England, is in a state of bad disorganization, with too few modern planes.

Much more serious is the fact that the basic plan for the army's expansion is defective. As in the First World War we are developing a slow, cumbersome mass army. Yet according to the testimony of German, French, and neutral observers the German troops which actually conquered the Low Countries and France consisted of only some twelve divisions, about 120,000 men. The bulk of the German army followed at the heels of the dive-bombers and armored units and played the part of policemen, consolidating and holding gains. The armored divisions, possessing great mobility and speed and from three to seven times the fire power of the older infantry units, were the effective striking force. Other troops had a purely secondary function. And despite the contrary claims of Allied propagandists, the losses of the attackers were remarkable small.

This revolution in warfare has been almost completely ignored by our army leaders. We now have two armored divisions, with two others planned, for an army which has been increased 600 per cent within a year. An army of four million men even is being discussed. If it is built up to this size without an increase in the armored branch, the American army will present the interesting spectacle of a force 1 per cent modern and 99 per cent obsolete. When a man in a tank or plane has been demonstrated to be worth ten or fifty or a hundred ordinary infantrymen armed with rifles, it is obviously foolish to multiply the number of infantrymen instead of the number of armored troops. Germany today probably has at least twenty *Panzer* divisions. Between twenty and forty are the indispensable minimum for us.

In a recent issue of the *Infantry Journal*, a progressive service publication, the view was expressed that the United States "might do worse than to duplicate the work of the Germans but probably could, and should,

do much better." Both parts of the statement are correct. Many of our army officers, for example, General Hugh A. Drum of the First Army, foresaw the armored division, parachute troops, dive-bombing in conjunction with infantry attacks, and other recent developments before these things had been tried out by any modern army. Under their leadership we could ultimately evolve a system of warfare as much better than that of the German army as German methods today are in advance of those of 1918. Unfortunately these are not the men who are in positions of leadership. Until recent months they have been the unhonored prophets or the suppressed rebels of American military life. Our typical army leaders obtained their positions after long years of competent but undistinguished service, with promotion on a basis of straight seniority. They are men who have resolutely closed their minds to new ideas; for the past hundred years the American army has rejected virtually every suggested improvement or invention until years after it had become an established success elsewhere. If we wish to make an army as good as the German army, the closed minds in the higher ranks must be eliminated—by arbitrary executive action if necessary. Advancement by seniority must be replaced by selection for merit. And the officers selected must be promoted to high command at an age when they are still at the height of their physical and mental powers.

The lack of vision of American military men is due partly to the cumbersome organization of both the army and the War Department. The functioning of the transport and supply services of the army has been a particular cause for complaint among field officers. The outstanding authority on military organization in the United States, General Johnson Hagood, has written: "The present organization of the Department of War is so involved that no Secretary of War has been able to understand it. . . . No archangel of heaven could operate a machine so badly constructed and so complicated as the War Department is under existing law . . . it would fall down immediately upon the outbreak of war."

The problem created by the presence of incompetent and reactionary officers in the higher ranks is not, of course, peculiar to the United States. The French army had its full share of backwardness. So did the British army—until recently. So did the German army—until Hitler ruthlessly weeded out the dead wood in the German High Command. One of the most striking features of the Nazi forces is the large proportion of young men in high positions. Men in their forties occupy posts as high as those held by American officers of sixty. And unlike the United States, Germany has made a systematic effort, through high pay and generous treatment, through entertainment and propaganda and obvious marks of national esteem, to create and maintain a magnificent morale among its soldiers. Thorough training of troops

in the field of their activity is another mark of the German system.

Our present selective-service law gives too many men too little training. For the less vital components of the modern army a year may suffice, but for the armored divisions and air force a lengthening of the period of service or the use of long-term volunteers is needed in order to do away with the rapid turnover of personnel.

One of the greatest defects of American defense has long been lack of coordination. Aside from the President, whom pressure of business normally makes unavailable, there is no person or group in Washington to coordinate the needs and plans of the various defense services



General George Marshall

with those of the United States as a whole. Congress is not in a position to offer help, for each of eight defense committees deals with only a certain part of the entire field and cannot see defense policies as a whole. There is a definite need for a national general staff composed of informed civilians and representatives of the air, sea, and land forces. At the same time heroic efforts must be made to break down the jealousies which have long inhibited the smooth cooperation of the navy with the army and the army with the air force.

Our naval air force is an integral part of the navy; it has no sense of separatism and gives intense loyalty to naval traditions. But there is little friendship or cooperation between the army air force and the army proper. Efforts to coordinate bombing with infantry attacks, for example, were made only during the last maneuvers and then rather clumsily, according to observers. Rightly or wrongly, many aviation men feel that their interests have been sacrificed by a reactionary High Command, which has been very jealous of its prestige and knows little of aviation. A formula for cooperation should be found which includes a frank recognition on the part of both defense branches of the utility of the other in winning modern wars.

All these improvements, however, will not guarantee an army capable of defeating German troops in the field. In war, superiority, not equality, must always be sought. The brilliant American officers whose theories of the art of war were first practiced by the more alert Germans must be given an opportunity to evolve means to surpass the Germans.

Everybody's Business

BY KEITH HUTCHISON

The New Economic Order

ADDRESSING the general assembly of the German Reichsbank recently, Dr. Funk, its president and also Nazi Minister of Economics, boasted: "Despite the British blockade, the volume of Germany's foreign trade has again almost reached its pre-war level." In view of the fact that Germany obtained some 50 per cent of its pre-war imports from countries to which access is now completely blocked, this statement at first sight naturally arouses skepticism. But Dr. Funk himself has an explanation of the seeming miracle. "Germany's exchange of goods with European countries," he tells us, "has risen by a round 65 per cent in the course of the past year.

It is perfectly possible that the Reichsbank president is, on this occasion, actually telling the truth, apart from his decidedly euphemistic use of the word "exchange." For there is no doubt that Germany has obtained during the past year enormous quantities of goods from the European countries which by force or "persuasion" have been brought within its orbit. To some extent these imports are the fruits of outright seizure, but a considerable part of the flow is the result of transactions which have at least a surface appearance of normal business deals.

The Nazi agent approaches the Danish farmer or French manufacturer offering the current market price, or even better, for the goods he requires. Commercial morality is thus far appeased and the farmer or manufacturer encouraged to sell without the use of coercion. But the question arises: Where does the Nazi agent get the kroner or francs which he flourishes temptingly under the seller's nose? The answer is that he gets them from the Danish National Bank and the Bank of France, both of which have been forced to open unlimited credits for German account. Alternatively they may have been obtained from the governments of those countries as "occupation costs," charged on a scale which leaves large free balances after actual expenses for the German forces within the conquered countries are met. In either case the Reich evades the necessity of exchanging goods against goods.

According to the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* of March 14, the credit which the Danish National Bank had been forced to grant to Germany had risen to 488,000,000 crowns by the end of February, 1941. But Danes went cold last winter, for although they exported their butter and bacon to the Reich, which commanded practically the entire coal supply of Europe, they were only permitted to buy extremely meager quantities of fuel. The other occupied countries are in a similar plight. Germany buys from them everything it can lay hands on, even badly needed food stocks, but sells only minimum quantities of the goods they desperately need. This is what Dr. Funk chooses to describe as "exchange."

The conditions of this one-sided commerce are, however, now changing. The occupied countries of the West have by this time been almost drained of existing stocks of commodities, and they can go on feeding the German war machine

only if their industries are put to work. This means they must be supplied with raw materials, and since raw materials throughout the Continent are under German control, the Nazi High Command is able to bend production in accordance with its own needs. Thus the *Agence Economique et Financière*, published in Paris, has stated that Germany is compelled to regard all raw materials, both within its own borders and in the occupied areas, as part of "a joint reserve, to be used primarily for the German war machine and only secondarily for civilian consumption."

Early this year negotiations started in Paris between German and Vichy officials to discuss the technique of economic collaboration, or in other words the utilization of French industry in accordance with German needs. In February a Salon Technique et Industriel Allemand was opened in Paris as a permanent institution, not, as might be thought, to attract buyers of German goods, but to encourage and educate potential French purveyors to Germany. On display are machinery, machine parts, and other metal products for which German industry is willing to sign subcontracts with French concerns. There are also sections devoted to the chemical and textile industries, and special offices where business can be transacted on the spot are available. If necessary, the Ger-



Drawing by Harry Roth

The Customer Is Always Right

man purchaser agrees to supply the needed raw materials.

German control over the industries of France and other occupied countries is being further tightened by the systematic buying up of their share capital. The "occupation costs" racket provides a steady flow of funds for this purpose, and many methods of making recalcitrant stockholders see the wisdom of selling have been reported. Among recent deals of this kind are the purchase of some \$5,000,000 worth of shares of the Algemeene Kunstzijde Unie, a large Dutch rayon company, by a German group and the acquisition by the Ruhr steel trust, Vereinigte Stahlwerke, of \$10,000,000 worth of shares in the Koninklijke Nederlandsche Hoogovens, one of the leading units in Dutch heavy industry. In the second of these cases the almost certainly unwilling seller was the City of Amsterdam.

In Holland the extraordinary export balance reported during the early months of the occupation has fallen off since the beginning of the year, and now, the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* reports, trade with Germany shows a considerable import balance. But, it should be noted, these imports are mainly raw materials destined to be worked up in Dutch factories and later returned to Germany as finished products. Altogether, according to the same source, Germany placed orders in Holland valued at over one billion guilders during the first quarter of this year. This expenditure will provide work and wages in Holland, but unless payment takes the form of imported consumers' goods it will do nothing to halt the rapid decline in the Dutch standard of living.

In France the German artificial-fibers cartel has obtained a 30 per cent participation in France Rayonne, a combination of twenty factories with a capital of half a billion francs. Because of the shortage of raw wool and cotton, synthetic-textile manufacture has become a key industry. The *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, in an article describing Franco-German collaboration, in this field states: "Germany is placing the necessary quantities of cellulose at the disposal of France, since French raw-material resources, even if fully exploited, would be insufficient. The significance of Franco-German cooperation in the textile industry lies in the fact that the productive capacity of the French rayon plants will be used to a large extent to supply the German market, while the expanded German cellulose industry will have to supply the French market with patents, raw materials, and probably with limited quantities of artificial wool."

Similar measures to reorganize French industry in accordance with the economic needs of the German *Wehrmacht* are being adopted in many other fields, notably in aluminum and steel production. As British bombings of German industrial areas increase in intensity, the Nazis are likely to rely more and more on the productive facilities of the occupied territories. But while the resulting diffusion of targets will add to the difficulties of the R. A. F., it must also swell the German transport problem by necessitating long additional hauls for raw materials and finished goods. Moreover, it will compel the Nazis to make available greater food supplies to their victims, for the factories cannot be kept running by starving workers.

[Correction. In the article on railroads in the June 14 issue, carloadings for the week ending October 26, 1940, were given as 637,651. The figure should have been 837,651.]

In the Wind

NEW YORK's coming mayoralty campaign will be the liveliest and most uncertain in years, and because almost every political group now operating in the country will be represented, it will be a national campaign in microcosm. Mayor LaGuardia is odds-on favorite for the Republican nomination. An attempt will be made to have the Democrats indorse LaGuardia, but Brooklyn's District Attorney William O'Dwyer is favored by the machine, and it is believed that nothing short of intervention by Roosevelt would win the nomination for the "little flower." Various fascist and Christian Front groups are backing George U. Harvey and Judge Herbert A. O'Brien inside the Democratic Party, but if O'Dwyer wins, the Coughlinites will support him despite his excellent liberal record. The right wing of the American Labor Party will support LaGuardia; the pro-Communist wing has considered backing Vito Marcantonio, but its plans will doubtless be changed by Russia's entry into the war.

THE REGENTS of the University of Georgia recently voted to retain Walter D. Cocking, Dean of Education, after Governor Talmadge sought to remove him from office because of his advocacy of a teachers' training school at which the pupils would be "both blacks and whites—in order to uplift the state of Georgia." As quoted by the *Chicago Tribune*, Talmadge said: "I'm not going to put up with any social equality in the university system of the state schools."

PROBABLY the last fellow-traveler to give the old, pre-June 22 Communist line was Rockwell Kent, who spoke over the N. B. C. hook-up at 4:30 p.m. on the day Hitler invaded Russia. Kent attacked the war, the defense program, and the intellectuals who support Britain.

ONCE DURING Elmer Davis's brief stay in England the New York office of the Columbia Broadcasting System invited the news commentator's wife to speak to her husband over the company's transatlantic telephone system. Mr. Davis's voice came over clearly, but he was noticeably reserved and distant for a man talking to his wife. Finally, as the conversation came to a close, Mr. Davis said, "I didn't quite get your name, but will you be sure to give my love to my family."

ANGERED BY *PM*'s exposé of Christian Front propaganda, the New York *Sunday Enquirer*, whose publisher was linked to the Front in several articles, recently made an effort to get back at the crusading tabloid. *PM* received a call from an *Enquirer* representative who said he had heard a rumor that the owners were planning a merger with the *Daily Worker*. The *Enquirer* man was assured that this was not the case. In its next issue the *Enquirer* ran a page 1 story headed, "*PM*, *Daily Worker* Will Not Merge."

[We invite our readers to submit material for *In the Wind*—either clippings with source and date or stories that can be clearly authenticated. A prize of \$5 will be awarded each month for the best item.—EDITORS THE NATION.]

A Native at Large

BY JONATHAN DANIELS

Soldiers Need Fun

BY THIS time I hope the United Service Organizations will already have every nickel of the \$10,000,000 they started out to get on June 3 in order to be able to run the recreation houses the government is going to build for the soldiers, sailors, and other essential participants in defense. But before the organizations, all but one of which are of a distinctly religious nature, start out to spend the money, I should like, as a country boy, to join that city slicker, Miss Elsa Maxwell, in saying a few words about this recreation for our defenders.

Miss Maxwell, who for years has been making her living by putting on parties for the city rich which sometimes sounded at least a little wacky to the country poor, has been out partying with the selectees. She went all the way down to Camp Robinson in Arkansas and came back to make a profound announcement to a lady reporter over luncheon at the Louis XIV Cafe. Soldiers, Miss Maxwell reported, are young and human, and they want fun.

There is nothing wacky about that pronouncement. It makes sense. And no other feeling about these young defenders of ours is going to make sense in the defense towns. Miss Maxwell recommends for them blind dates with nice girls and free beer from nice brewers. Such a plan might encounter difficulties. I am specifically not advocating it. But I am hoping that at least as much of this \$10,000,000 is spent on fun as on organized goodness.

I favor providing for the "welfare and spiritual needs" of the young men. I know there are problems of welfare around the defense towns, scandalously neglected ones so far. I know there are times when a boy may want more than anything else the consolation he could get from a priest, preacher, or rabbi, maybe even from a Y. M. C. A. secretary. But I know that what the big mass of the young in defense want is some fun when they get through a week of maneuvering across Tennessee or a day of taking gadgets apart and putting them together again in California. They could take care of their own welfare by staying at the camp. In most posts they could find chaplains for their spiritual needs. But they're going to town. That is why the government is building these recreation centers in the towns to which they go.

A famous architect has designed the recreation houses, but there seems to be some confusion as to the people they are being built for. Depending upon the local or

national view, our young defender seems often to be two things, neither of which, I think, he is: he is the roughneck who has to be watched close at hand, or he is the infant for whom elaborate protective processes are being devised at a distance. Evidence can undoubtedly be arrayed to support both views. There are roughnecks in the army. Young men do need protection from some dangers. But the greater truth is that the soldiers, sailors, and defense workers in America today are young men typical of the boys in our own towns. Most of them are pretty good boys. Indeed, in large measure they are the selected and not merely the drafted. But they are young. They want fun, excitement, girls, and sometimes an amazing amount of noise, which they call music.

Most of them would prefer good girls to bad ones. Most of them would rather have a chance at decent fun than the stinking blatancy of the campside honky-tonks. But our young defender is American youth, 1941 model and he is going to be pulled away from the dangerous entertainers, who have had at least a year of experience in entertaining him, only if he is offered recreation corresponding to what he wants and not to what the righteous and the protective think he needs.

For that job \$10,000,000 is not much money in this defense spending. If it is wasted in wrong-headed righteousness, not much money will be lost. But a lot might be lost in time and morale if there is continuing loneliness and boredom and dangerous young adventuring after satisfactions in strange, crowded countrysides.

The collection has been taken, and I've put my money in the plate of the rabbis, priests, preachers, laymen Y. M. C. A. secretaries, welfare workers, and Salvation Army drum-beaters and doughnut dispensers. In with my money I put my hope that they would do a good job. But I'm expecting to get the value of my money—it was not much—for America only if the emphasis in the recreation houses is put on the ideas of the young who are to be entertained rather than on those of the undoubtedly consecrated and devoted men who are to be in charge of the entertaining. This is the soldiers' and sailors' money—this \$10,000,000—and it ought to be spent for their fun. The best way to protect them—to build their morale—is to please them.

You've got to get them and hold them before you can save them.

Please, let's have fun. There is no scarcity even now of solemnity.

BOOKS *and the* ARTS

Notes by the Way

THE *Retail Bookseller* recently printed a statement by the editor of Modern Age Books that is rather discouraging for book lovers whose buying is limited by book prices. Modern Age began by publishing new books, as well as reprints, at 25 cents. The venture seemed to be going well at first, but sales were not sufficient to justify the large printings which were in turn necessary to keep down the unit cost of each book. A new range of prices, from 50 to 95 cents, was tried and for a time seemed to be the right formula. Then the average sale began to drop. Since November, 1939, Modern Age has published new books at "regular" prices of \$2 or above.

The chief difficulty, according to Modern Age, is a lack of widespread distribution facilities. "Book outlets have been too few in number to allow wide display of low-cost titles, and . . . potential buyers were not reached." The *Retail Bookseller*, which is concerned of course with proving that book prices are not too high, expresses doubt that this potential market exists and repeats the old argument that a low price makes people suspect there is something wrong with the product; it does not go on to say what I suspect is far more to the point, that bookstores, which to judge by their relatively small number are not highly profitable enterprises, naturally prefer to display and sell those books which yield a greater unit return.

The arguments of the *Retail Bookseller* seem to me to be weakened by the fact that cheap reprints are sold in large quantities; it was new books that Modern Age was unable to sell successfully at low prices. This does not mean, however, that I subscribe to the theory that books are just another commodity, like toothpaste, and susceptible to the same methods of mass production and sale. The habit of cleaning one's teeth is almost universal; the market for toothpaste need not be created but only competed for. The habit of reading is fairly widespread, to judge by the circulation of cheap magazines—though these magazines are kept going by advertisers, not by readers. The habit of reading books is relatively much less common; and while I think there is a great potential market, the problem of opening it up involves cultural as well as economic factors. The editor of Modern Age thinks that "the more successful Pocket Books, Penguin, and other low-cost ventures become, the wider will be the distribution of reprint titles. And in time, if a successful tradition of sale continues, distribution outlets will spring up around these low-cost books. From that point on it should be possible to issue an occasional new book." However, he thinks "it is bound to be years before the practice of issuing new books at low cost can become general in America. It costs more to manufacture new books, and of course they lack the initial sales advantage possessed by a reprint of a previous best-seller. From every point of view they are a greater economic risk than reprint publications." This sounds sensible, though it seems unlikely that this increased book-

buying public will ever be inclined to pay \$2.50 for an unknown new book when it has got used to buying books of known value for 25 cents.

The *Retail Bookseller* concludes, a little triumphantly, that "books do *not* cost so much!" As a stubborn consumer I should put it differently. The success of reprints—of which the apparent prosperity of the Readers' Club is another example—and the testimony of my own pocket-book convince me that new books *do* cost too much, but this seems to be a necessary evil which will continue as long as the pattern of their production and sale follows, for whatever reasons, that of Rolls Royces rather than Fords. It will continue, in other words, until the potential large market, which I believe exists, is opened up and the publishing business can be shifted to something like a mass-production basis.

MARGARET MARSHALL

A Call for Action

THE TIME IS NOW! By Pierre van Paassen. The Dial Press. \$1.

MR. VAN PAASSEN has written a brilliant sketch of Hitler's present ambitions, particularly with respect to the United States. Of the many speculations on that subject which have been poured out in recent months no other has seemed to hit the nail so squarely on the head. Despite some wild statements about the alleged influence of the Munich Geopolitical Institute on German foreign policy during the last two generations, which I shall return to, he has succeeded to a truly remarkable degree in penetrating to the inner nerve of Hitler's policy, the logic behind his moves, his subterfuges, and his devices.

Mr. van Paassen rightly recognizes as the pivotal point of Hitler's policy his remarkable attempt to win a war that is essentially a war to control the seas without a navy and on land. Hitler is pitting his armies against the British navy in an attempt to bring the whole of the Old World under his control; he is trying to eliminate Britain as a world power by systematically depriving it of any foothold on the land, while at the same time he seeks to dominate the shipping lanes of the world by means of submarines and planes. His ultimate objective is to encircle, after the defeat of Britain, the last source of resistance to his plans, the United States—in the east from Iceland and Greenland to the Azores, Dakar, and the Cape, and in the west from the Behring Sea to Singapore.

In tracing out this sweeping plan of campaign in more detail Van Paassen scores many hits against the blind optimism that has obscured it. The German drive in the Balkans, far from being an act of desperation to prevent the British from creating an eastern front, "was a carefully executed, perfectly timed detail of the master-plan." "When Hitler loudly blamed British and American diplomacy for Belgrade's final decision to make a stand, we fell into the trap. We

failed to realize that this resistance to his demands was precisely what he desired, and that he had engineered matters to that end." Van Paassen thinks Hitler's plans in the Near East include a drive along the African east coast to Cape Town, where the nationalist Boer opposition would enable him to stage a repetition of the Sudetenland farce, and an advance through Persia and Afghanistan to India.

In the final act of the drama, when the whole of Africa and of the Near and Middle East had fallen into German hands, the United States would face in "splendid isolation" a hostile Old World. With insufficient forces to defend the whole of the Americas' 30,000 miles of coastline, we should be forced to give up the greater part of South America "desperately clamping ourselves to what are, after all, mere secondary positions at Panama and in the Caribbean."

To avert such an encirclement Van Paassen proposes the immediate dispatch of an expeditionary force to Dakar, in order to prevent Hitler from seizing this decisive point in the "world-wide pincer movement of the Axis against the Western Hemisphere" and the Cape Verde, Canary, and Azores Islands; the staging of a naval demonstration at Singapore, to assist Britain in the defense of India against the Germans attacking from the west and the Japanese from the east; and the immediate drafting of a plan of full cooperation between the American and British navies, with the American fleet conveying war material to Britain, in order that the Battle of the Atlantic may not be lost to Hitler.

To see America in the role of a mere sympathetic onlooker to Britain's tragedy is Herr Hitler's fondest desire. For his projects envisage the consecutive, separate, installment-plan conquests of Britain and America modeled on the tactics he has so far pursued, on a miniature scale, in Europe.

Mr. van Paassen's penetrating analysis of Hitler's strategy would be even more admirable if, in his eagerness to enhance the force of his warnings, he had not attempted to bolster them up with a series of grotesque statements about the influence of the Geopolitical Institute, and to present Hitler's plans for world domination merely as the execution of the schemes evolved over almost half a century by that institution. To assert that "the real conflict between the Kaiser and Bismarck was based on Wilhelm's adoption of geopolitical ideas then sponsored by the Institute of Political Oceanography" and that "Kaiser Wilhelm believed in Germany's destiny as a mistress of not only Europe but of the whole world" is as grotesque a falsification of history as the statement that "the Geopolitical Institute has existed since 1897, and its ideology has fermented in the minds of German political thinkers since 1870," and that "the German government—whether a Kaiserreich, republic, or totalitarian state—enthusiastically sponsored a planning academy whose function was to develop a long-range project for the domination of the world." The truth is that German foreign policy has had no such continuity as is here ascribed to it; it did not harbor under the Kaiser, still less under the Weimar Republic, any such worldwide ambitions as have dominated it under the Nazis. As to the Geopolitical Institute and its alleged influence as the "Reich's political and military planning academy," all talk about the institute's existence prior to the World War is nonsense. The geopolitical movement, not the

institute, rose under the influence of the defeat and in opposition to the Weimar Republic; and its influence, or rather that of its head, Professor Haushofer, dates from Hitler's accession to power in 1933.

HERBERT ROSINSKI

Eros and Agape

LOVE IN THE WESTERN WORLD. By Denis de Rougemont. Harcourt, Brace and Company. \$3.

THE perfectly handsome and good young man meets the perfectly lovely and good young woman amid the perfectly beautiful and good scenery of nature, and soon they are that way about each other. Of course, there are obstacles—to make the story interesting—but one by one they are overcome. The rivals are honest enough to reveal themselves in their true light, the husbands and wives considerate enough to die and leave a fortune, and the curtain falls to the music of the angels as the divine pair fall into each other's arms forever. All this is not a myth; it really happened; the camera and technicolor cannot lie.

But how are Tom and Mary, for whom the curtain does not fall, to do likewise?

"It isn't easy," Tom reflects, "to be a god. Is any razor blade or hair cream really fool-proof? Is my tailor reliable? What job will bring me ten thousand dollars a year, yet not take up any of my time?" "It isn't easy," Mary also reflects, "to be a goddess, when it's always August underneath the arms. Ought I to change my diet? Is my laundry a tattle-tale gray? Do I serve the right coffee? Will having a child ruin my ankles?"

And of course their fears are justified. They cease to be gods to each other and become unromantic human beings, smelly, aging, selfish, and irritable. But they have been brought up to believe in the myth of passion; that is, that only perfection is worthy to be loved. "Tom never calls me the only girl in the world now," moans Mary, and Tom hums grimly,

I took her for better or worse but she
Was worse than I took her for,

and it is hardly surprising if they seek in a series of "affairs" to rekindle the sacred flame.

"Love in the Western World" is a history of this romantic myth from its inception in the courtly love of Provence down to its latest personal and political forms. Its thesis may be summarized thus: at the root of the romantic conception of ideal sexual passion lies Manicheism, a dualistic heresy introduced into Europe from the East, which held matter to be the creation of the Evil One and therefore incapable of salvation. From this it follows that all human institutions like marriage are corrupt, and perfection can be reached only by death, in which the limitations of matter are finally transcended and the soul is merged into the infinite nothingness of the Logos. The primary expression of this myth is the Tristan legend which culminates in Wagner's opera. To Tristan and Isolde love is, first, something predestined, for which they have no moral responsibility; and, second, something which can exist in the world of time only so long as there are obstacles to its physical consummation; only after death can they be at last eternally identified in the Infinite.

This legend in its turn creates its negative mirror image, the legend that begins with Jean de Meung and culminates in Mozart's *Don Giovanni*. Here it is the flesh that is asserted and the spirit that is denied; the present moment is all, the eternal future nothing. Tristan sees time as something evil to be passively endured; Don Juan sees time as something evil to be aggressively destroyed: the former is a suicide, the latter a murderer. But they have three things in common: both are interesting sinners; both lack all knowledge of the loved as a person; both "appear sword in hand." The two roles of the myth can combine only in a collective form, in warfare, where every individual is at one and the same time a masochistic murderess and the sadistic murderer, or in the political relationship of the impassioned leader and the impassioned masses.

Equally opposed to both isotopes of Eros stands the Christian doctrine of Agape.

The incarnation of the Word in the world is the astounding event whereby we are delivered from the woe of being alive . . . for the Incarnation to have occurred is the radical negation of every kind of religion . . . [which] tends to subliminate man, and leads to the condemning of his "finite" life . . . men can only achieve salvation by ceasing to be, by being "lost" in the bosom of the divine. But in Christianity this process is completely inverted. What the Gospel calls dying to self is the *beginning* of a new life already *here below*. It is an immediate reassertion, not of course of the old life, and not of an ideal life, but of our present life now repossessed by the Spirit. . . . Thereupon to love is no longer to reject the act of love. To Eros individual beings were so many defects of the one and only being and as such none was susceptible of being really loved. . . . Christian love is obedience in the present. For to love God is to obey God, who has commanded us to love one another. In reply to the ironical question: "Who is my neighbor?" Jesus answered: "Whoever has need of you."

My only criticism of Mr. de Rougemont's profound and brilliant study is that I find his definition of Eros a little vague. He sometimes speaks as if he meant, which I am sure he does not, that Eros is of sexual origin and that there is a dualistic division between Agape and Eros rather than—as I am sure he believes—a dialectical relation. For Eros, properly, is "*amor sementa in voi d'ogni virtute, e d'ogni operazione che merta pene*," the basic will to self-actualization without which no creature can exist, and Agape is that Eros created by Grace, a conversion, not an addition, the Law fulfilled, not the Law destroyed. That is why the symbol of Agape is not the act of sex but the act of nutrition: just as eating is the one primal act common to all living organisms irrespective of species, race, age, sex, or consciousness, the one act in which, since we demand all and give nothing, we are necessarily completely alone, therefore only this act can testify to the utter dependence of all creatures on each other, to the fact that *everyone* is our neighbor.

Non-human nature lives in the world of the actual, and it also finds there its natural limits. As a physical organism man lives in the same world, but as a conscious being he also exists in the world of the possible. The task of the human being is how to actualize the possible by a series of decisions in which one future possibility is grasped by the present, and the rest thereby rendered impossible. But to be aware that

more than one possibility exists is to be aware that it is possible to make the wrong decision, that self-actualization is only achieved if the right decision is taken, and that if any of the wrong decisions are taken, the result will be self-negation. The human Eros is thus placed in a "catastrophic situation," to avoid the reality of which it tends to flee in two directions. Either it hides from the possible and attempts to live, like the animals, only in the actual. But for man the actual is no longer in fact limiting on his consciousness, so that, unless he goes mad, the result is the opposite of his intention; the conscious world of possibilities invades and destroys the unconscious world of actualities. Don Juan's intelligence tyrannizes over his phallus, and his relations with women are a succession of possible relationships that are never realized.

Or, alternatively, man's Eros can hide from the actual and attempt to live only in the possible; but again, since his physical body in fact is limited by the actual, unless he gets sick, the result is that the physical world invades and destroys his consciousness. Tristan's relation to Isolde has no possibilities because it is tied to a past event—the drinking of the love potion.

How is man to be delivered from "the body of this death," so that his Eros may have the courage to take decisions? His first answer is a collective one, the Myth and the Law, whereby rules are laid down for all specific occasions, and the number of conscious possibilities is reduced to a minimum. But this works only as long as the collective Eros is strong enough to submerge the individual Eros; as soon as a society begins to differentiate, the individual becomes conscious of more possibilities than society officially admits, and realizes that the polytheistic myths are only social conventions. Now, either, like the Chinese, he must accept this fact and sacrifice development to stability or, like the West, he must face the catastrophic situation alone. It is at this point of historical development that the concept of passion appears. Sex as a collective unconscious force had been worshiped before (e. g., sacred prostitution), but now for the first time self-actualization is thought of in terms of a single conscious sexual relationship which gathers to it all the functions which had previously been discharged by the many collective myths; hence its greater intensity. Once again its purpose is the same, to eliminate the possibility of making wrong decisions, to dispense with what the Christian believes to be essential, namely, Faith.

Though the myth of passion has a long history, men's actual sexual relationships continued to be, to a large degree, conditioned by unromantic social conventions, and it is not until the nineteenth century that both religious faith and bourgeois convention become weak enough for the myth to be regarded as a scientific theory of life. It is only in the past hundred years that people have seriously tried to marry their mater-imagos or their lame shadows, and it is only quite recently that, dismayed at the failure of this attempt, they have denied the significance of personal relations altogether and returned to a collective and political myth of Eros.

In the last few chapters of his book Mr. de Rougemont states the Christian doctrine of marriage, which will seem absurdly straightlaced to the hedonist and shockingly coarse to the romantic. But perhaps the unpleasant consequences of

romantic love and romantic politics are making thoughtful people more willing to reconsider it than they were while a bourgeois convention, which professed to be Christian but was nothing of the kind, was still à la mode.

W. H. AUDEN

Norman Thomas's Odyssey

WE HAVE A FUTURE. By Norman Thomas. Princeton University Press. \$2.50.

CANDOR has always been a rare virtue. It is growing rarer in these days of sharp cleavages and neurotic extolment of causes which those who shout loudest often neither understand nor care about. The appearance of a frank and honest examination of vital social problems is therefore an exhilarating experience. "We Have a Future," by Norman Thomas, is just such an examination.

Although it deals with the thesis which has absorbed Norman Thomas all through his long public career, this book differs from most of his other works, and from books written by other Socialists, in that it reveals the author to be no longer paying homage to some of the fetishes in which every good Socialist has heretofore had to profess a belief. He refuses, for instance, to cling to the theory of the class struggle in a world where the effort to create a classless society in a country spreading over one-sixth of the earth's surface produced the Stalin bureaucracy. Even more meaningless, he believes, is this theory in our own country, where workers, farmers, technicians, and professionals think of themselves "to an amazing degree as middle class." The same reasoning leads him to discard the sentimental notion that the wage-earner is destined to become society's messiah. Reduced to the status of "romantic nonsense" is the thought of successful violent revolution in these days of bombers, tanks, and artillery. Instead, "any program of social action must be more or less gradual, however revolutionary its goal." Mr. Thomas has even abandoned hope of a labor party in this country.

He has discovered no infallible or dogmatic guide for achieving a good society. We need wisdom and skill, hope, conviction, and loyalty; and, above all, he says, we must safeguard the democratic channels within which these qualities may be utilized in planning and experiment. Whether the experimentation leads to a greater or lesser degree of collectivism or individualism is not so important. What is impor-

tant is that we have a clear idea of the end to be sought abundance for all and freedom for the individual.

Most liberals will approve of these ends and means. (One point only does Mr. Thomas invite argument. He so firmly believes—or perhaps it is only a fervent hope—that these ends can be sought and attained without a military defeat of the forces of aggression now abroad in the world. It is precisely this part of his argument, however, which I recommend the book to all those who by the long or short route have made peace with themselves in the matter of allowing Britain, defeating Hitlerism, and redeeming democracy at no matter what cost. The book will not alter their convictions, but it will give them a necessary realization of the risks involved. More than that, it will, or should, make them aware of the stark fact that war alone, even victorious war will not automatically provide the basis for a decent society. This delusion is common and must be guarded against.

"What sort of material," he asks, "will survive the war either side of the Channel to build the new world?" I am in contention that you cannot bomb people into sanity can hardly be gainsaid. "What sort of new generation, starved in body and sick in soul with the horrors amid which they have grown up, will be left for the tasks that lie ahead? What formula of democracy can they carry out? Granting that the peoples of occupied countries will hate Germany and the Germans, will they love England and the English after twelve, three, four, or more years of blockade? Or will new hate be added to the old?"

"We Have a Future" is probably the nearest Norman Thomas will get to an autobiography for a long time. It is a statement of deeply cherished convictions, of shattered hopes, yet of abounding faith in the decency of man, the vitality of democracy, and the ultimate combination of the two in the endeavor to bring about a saner world. This hopeful outlook is due in large measure to the fact that he will not allow himself the "luxury of despair." As a writer and speaker Norman Thomas is always crisp, keen, and stimulating. In this latest product of his brain and pen these qualities are at their best.

ROSE M. STEIN

Elizabeth Madox Roberts

NOT BY STRANGE GODS. By Elizabeth Madox Roberts. The Viking Press. \$2.50.

MISS ROBERTS died four days before this volume of short stories was published. She was fifty-five, and her first book, "Under the Tree," a volume of short poetry about childhood, came out nineteen years ago. In those nineteen years she published two volumes of verse, two of short stories, and seven novels, or more than a book a year. She must have been writing steadily, and it is easy to believe that she did little else. She never married, she was painfully shy, she stayed close to Kentucky, where she was born and where she died. Her life was uneventful in a superficial sense, probably, but in the world she had made she must have lived intensely and passionately.

This world is, by the map, Kentucky. But it is a Kentucky that lived solely in Miss Roberts's mind and heart. Her first and best novel, "The Time of Man," introduces a Kentuck-



Tobacco Road. The food is bacon and pone, the houses are cabins, nobody has enough to wear or to eat, nobody goes anywhere or does anything except be born and grow up and marry and die. But this world is as different from Mr. Caldwell's world as day from night. Out of his shiftless poor whites Mr. Caldwell wrings irony, wit, tragic squalor. Miss Roberts is without humor and she is never squalid. Nobody was ever less of a tractarian than she. A good illustration of this is the first story in "Not by Strange Gods," The Haunted Palace. In it a fine manor house, deserted by the gentry that had once lived in it, tumbling down, set in a tangled park, is taken over by a share-cropper and his family. In the great parlors, with their carved white woodwork and their polished floors, the share-cropper and his wife bring their sheep at lambing time. The house is filled with ghosts—of the music that had been made on the grand piano, of blue and gold wall hangings, of stables full of blooded horses, and a lovingly tended garden. But the polished floors are slippery and wet, and two dead lambs have been thrown in the great fireplace out of the way. In about thirty pages Miss Roberts presents two completely different modes of living, two educations, two cultures. But she is not concerned with whether one is "better" than the other, or whether one is the result of the other. Here they are, sharply drawn, and moral judgments are complicated things. If you must have one, you will have to make it yourself.

In this world she has made there is a great deal of poetry. It is in the songs the people sing, the thoughts the young girls—and even the old men—have, most of all in their common speech: "I want to be like you are, but you want to be like some other kind you can't name or say." "There's always fault on both sides, though, and it's never all one person's blame, I always say." "Then I recollect spring. Yes I recall. Then come fall and warm politics on. I recollect the barbecue on the creek and old man Hardin on the stump for office." "I feel like I could pick up a hill or I could break open a mountain with my fist, and what call have I got to be afeared of a lonesome sound tonight?" These quotations, chosen at random from several books, are indicative of the poetically unreal, strange, and yet winning speech of Miss Roberts's characters. They are dialect, full of old saws and folk wisdom. Paradoxically, they sound like the authentic speech of these particular people, although these people never lived, in Kentucky or anywhere else.

Miss Roberts's world is never seen quite clearly. There is always the illusion of distance, of muffled sound, of indistinct edges, of a veil between the persons in the book and the reader. Even in "My Heart and My Flesh," when the social stratum is different, and the characters are urbane and cultivated, there is still this feeling of distance, of persons not quite human, although—another paradox—not unreal.

Finally, if in some sense this Kentucky is unreal, it is nevertheless continually fresh and interesting, the language is sweet and strange, the people are warm, passionate, complicated. Although probably Miss Roberts reached her peak in her first book, all the qualities that made it original and appealing are in the last one. American literature would be inestimably poorer if Kentucky had never known her; and if she had never known her own peculiar Kentucky.

DOROTHY VAN DOREN

THE WITCH-BURNING OF BERTRAND RUSSELL!

Here are all the shocking facts behind a judicial decision that will be long remembered for its injustice and bigotry!

The most notorious abuse of academic freedom in recent years was the cancellation of the contract under which Bertrand Russell was to have taught at the College of the City of New York. Here, nine eminent scholars join in presenting the incredible facts. As an authoritative account of the ecclesiastical, social and political forces that led to the now notorious Russell Case, this book must be pondered and heeded

**THE
BERTRAND RUSSELL
CASE** by all those who would defend free thought. The Viking Press. \$2.50
by Nine Scholars
Edited by John Dewey
and Horace M. Kallen

To keep abreast of HISTORY in the MAKING

FILL OUT AND MAIL THIS

Order Form

THE NATION • 55 FIFTH AVE. • NEW YORK

In order for me to keep abreast of history in the making, please enter my subscription to *The Nation* for the period indicated below. I inclose \$.....

- ☐ One Year \$5
☐ Two Years \$8
☐ Three Years \$11

Special Introductory Offer

- ☐ 13 Weeks \$1

Name.....

Address.....

Foreign and Canadian postage \$1 a year

6-28-41

QUISISANA CAMPS

At Center Lovell, in Maine's Pine Woods in the White Mountain Region
SITUATED ON LAKE KEZAR, THE MOST BEAUTIFUL LAKE IN AMERICA

QUAINT • RESTFUL • ROMANTIC

Cheerful individual cottages with bath, fireplaces, electricity.
Main Lodge rooms with or without private bath. Food of highest
quality, wholesome, tempting. Golf, tennis, boating, swimming,
natural sand beach. Excellent fishing: Salmon, Black Bass,
Brook Trout. Non-Sectarian. Ownership-Management.

RATES FROM \$35 A WEEK AMERICAN PLAN WRITE FOR BOOKLET
SPECIAL RATES TO JULY 15 Quisisana Camps, Center Lovell, Maine

Order your BOOKS from THE NATION

At the request of many readers who reside in communities in which no bookshop has been established, *The Nation* offers to deliver any book to your door at the regular publisher's price (postfree) provided payment is received with the order or publisher's price plus postage if sent C. O. D.

Please address your orders to

THE READERS' SERVICE DIVISION

The Nation • 55 Fifth Avenue • New York

DECISION

"We greatly need a literary review of such standards."
—THORNTON WILDER

Starting with the July issue . . .

1. THOMAS MANN will be *Chairman* of DECISION'S Editorial Advisory Board and will be a regular contributor.
2. MURIEL RUKEYSER, outstanding American poetess of the new generation, appears as DECISION'S Associate Editor.

Featured in the July number . . . Malcolm Cowley, *The Michael Golden Legend*; Carson McCullers, *The Russian Realists and Southern Literature*; Irwin Ross, *The Labor Crisis*; Sidney Janis, *Self-taught Painters*. STORIES by James Stern and Ellis St. Joseph.

---SUBSCRIPTION RESERVATION FORM---

Decision, 141 East 29th St., New York City

Gentlemen: Send me DECISION at the special rates offered readers of THE NATION:

8 months for \$2.00 (you save \$.80)

4 months for \$1.00 (you save \$.40)

I enclose cash, and therefore, will be given one issue free

Name.....

Address.....

June Copies Still on Sale at Better Stands

Fighting Editor

EDITOR IN POLITICS. By Josephus Daniels. University of North Carolina Press. \$3.50.

"TAR HEEL EDITOR" told the story of the author's early years. The second volume of Mr. Daniels's recollections begins with his taking a job in the Interior Department under Cleveland and ends when he enters Wilson's Cabinet as Secretary of the Navy. In between it is essentially a local story. The politics of the title are North Carolina politics, and the personalities with which the narrative abounds are in the main North Carolina personalities. Cleveland figures, of course, and Bryan; but Mr. Daniels took part in the Bryan campaigns as a representative of his state, and his job under the Cleveland Administration seems, from what he says, to have consisted largely in getting jobs for other North Carolina politicians.

"Politician" as applied to Mr. Daniels has no derogatory implications. A man more transparently, almost naively, honest never lived, nor a more public-spirited citizen. It was only right that a successful candidate should reward those who had contributed to his success, each according to his deserts. Mr. Daniels did not question this any more than he questioned free silver, a low tariff, the Baptist faith, and the maintenance of white supremacy by fair means or, regretably, foul, if necessary. But kindly, charming, and devoted to the welfare of his community as he was, he was no respecter of persons where his principles were involved. He was a courageous fighter for what he thought was right and often risked ruin to uphold it. Within the limitations of his place and time he was a sincere liberal. He not only took a stand against child labor and for shorter hours, better wages, wider and better education, but he did not hesitate to name names, though they were those of the most powerful people in the state. He also exposed persons in clerical, legal, and educational circles who knew on which side their bread was buttered. It is often harder to do this in a small community than to denounce the source of the evil, but he never shrank from the duty.

His reward was the respect and affection of all right-thinking men who knew him. He had not expected high office, but when it was offered to him he accepted it without surprise and as part of his duty to his fellow-citizens. From Cleveland to Wilson the wheel had come full circle, bringing Mr. Daniels once more on to a wider stage. It is scarcely possible for anyone not familiar with the issues which agitated North Carolina in the interval to follow Mr. Daniels's account of these intervening years with interest in all the details. He gains the reader's regard, however, and one looks forward to the volume to come which will cover the Wilson Administration, the War of 1914-18, and Mexico under the New Deal.

JAMES ORRICK

In Coming Issues of The Nation

"The New Criticism" by John Crowe Ransom

REVIEWED BY LOUISE BOGAN

"The Brontës' Web of Childhood"

by Fannie Elizabeth Ratchford

REVIEWED BY LIONEL TRILLING

IN BRIEF

GENERALS AND GENERALSHIP.

By General Sir Archibald Wavell.
The Macmillan Company. 50 cents.

These lectures would be remarkable for their intelligence, imagination, humor, and humanity at any time. They are even more so when one considers that though they were delivered before the outbreak of the present war they clearly state the essentials for getting the jump on methods since put into practice by the Germans—essentials now obvious but then not grasped even by many civilians, and of course by almost no generals. General Wavell is, moreover, no mere commentator on a particular moment in military history. He draws on a tradition which includes Socrates, Wellington, and Tolstoy; and his mind, like his style, appears to be endowed with simplicity, directness, and flexibility.

SIR RICHARD BURTON'S WIFE. By Jean Burton. Alfred A. Knopf. \$3.

It may be hard to believe that any woman could be a match for Sir Richard Burton, but his wife was as extraordinary as he was. If he was a devil, she was a whirlwind. The author, who is only a very distant connection, does full justice to her subject. She succeeds in bringing out the comic side without spoiling the dramatic. This is a book to be read for plain enjoyment.

EVERYONE'S CHILDREN, NOBODY'S CHILD.

By Justine Wise Polier. Charles Scribner's Sons. \$2.75.
The author is Children's Court Judge of the Domestic Relations Court of the City of New York. Her case histories naturally come from New York, and the United States as a whole is dealt with mostly in terms of statistics and generalities. A historical section describes attempts to solve the problem of delinquent children in the past, both here and in England. The book brings home the nature and extent of that problem day, but does not offer a radical cure.

WHY FREEDOM MATTERS.

By Norman Angell. Penguin Books. 25 cents.
Since the real fight is the fight for freedom, Sir Norman Angell, recognizing that a war cannot be won without a temporary relinquishment of liberty, feels that it is imperative to retain a clear idea of its nature. A vigorous statement of its fundamentals, an exposition of Mill's classic case, and a succinct consideration of the problems of liberty in

practice make up a book which no one concerned for a more democratic post-war world should miss.

JOHN DRYDEN. Some Biographical Facts and Problems. By James M. Osborn. Columbia University Press. \$3.50.

Though Dryden has recently resumed his place as a major English poet, it will probably never be possible to present his life and character fully or picturesquely, for the simple reason that he died just a little before the time when it became usual to preserve the sort of records necessary for a colorful biography. But modern antiquarian research is so much more systematic and laborious than anything dreamed of by persons who lived much nearer to Dryden that small points may still be cleared up and certain traditions either documented or discredited. In the present volume the author first minutely examines the sources and methods of all the important early biographers of Dryden and then presents the results of his own investigation of various minor questions. The result is not likely to make any great appeal to the average reader, but it will prove invaluable to students of the subject. The book is an impressive demonstration of the author's competence in the highly specialized field of antiquarian investigation.

PUBLISHED THIS WEEK

WAR IN THE DESERT: THE BATTLE FOR AFRICA. By Raoul Aglion. Holt. \$2.75.

SIR RICHARD BURTON'S WIFE. By Jean Burton. Knopf. \$3.

SAY, IS THIS THE U. S. A. By Erskine Caldwell and Margaret Bourke-White. Duell, Sloan, and Pearce. \$3.75.

EUROPE IN RETREAT. Third Edition. By Vera Micheles Dean. Knopf. \$2.75.

SWEET THAMES RUN SOFTLY. By Robert Gibbings. Dutton. \$2.50.


THE SHADOW OF THE ARROW. By Margaret Long. Caxton Printers. \$3.50.

TEN OLD ENGLISH POEMS PUT INTO MODERN ENGLISH ALLITERATIVE VERSE. By Kemp Malone. Johns Hopkins Press. \$1.25.

POEMS. By Ridgely Torrence. Macmillan. \$1.75.

THE BOYS IN THE BACK ROOM. Notes on California Novelists. By Edmund Wilson. Colt Press. \$2.50.

ECONOMIC HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. By Chester W. Wright. McGraw-Hill. \$4.



Be Different GIVE THE BRIDE BOOKS

There are books on cooking, etiquette, decorating, children, health and countless other subjects . . . books which enable her to gain experience the quickest and pleasantest way. Any bookseller will help you to make the right selection.

AMERICAN BOOKSELLERS ASSN.
Members Everywhere

More circulation for YOU!

You can advertise in *The Nation* now for the same cost as you did when our circulation was touching the 31,000 mark. Now you can reach more than 5,000 additional readers.

Phone us not later than Monday morning if you want your advertisement to appear in the issue out on Thursday.

62 CENTS A LINE
(6 words)

MINIMUM 3 LINES

\$6.16 AN INCH

Discount Rates given
upon request

THE NATION
55 Fifth Ave.
ALgonquin 4-3311

RESORT

LE HAMEAU on Delaware River. Mountains. 1200 ft. Unexcelled French-American cuisine. River sports, tennis on premises. June \$18. Rigaud & Simon, EQUINUNK, Pa.

CHILDREN'S CAMPS

ALYSSUM

"Day Camp for Boys and Girls"
SOMETHING ENTIRELY NEW IN ACCOMMODATION FOR PARENTS AND CHILDREN

A luxurious hotel combined with a modern camp for boys & girls 3-13. Cultural-Occupational work. Write for particulars: Box 7, Armonk, New York

PIONEER YOUTH CAMP

Established 1924

BOYS and GIRLS, 6 to 15 YEARS*

Now registering for group leaving July 2. Creative, non-profit-making. For information, write or telephone to Mrs. F. Frumes, 219 W. 29 St., N.Y.C. PE 6-3034.

* For young people in High School
Work Camp at Special Rates

SUMMER RENTALS

A CAREFREE VACATION

FOR GROUP OF FOUR FAMILIES

Large four-room house on spacious grounds of small farm hotel. Beautiful countryside, just 55 miles from New York. All sports—children's counselor. Wonderful farm-fresh foods. Special low rate for seasonal reservation.

LOCUST GROVE FARM, SYLVAN LAKE
Hopewell Junction, N. Y. Tel: PLaza 3-8926

Peekskill vicinity sublease furnished four-room porch bungalow screened, private natural lake, tennis, handball, refrigeration, formerly \$400. Large reduction suitable family, child. MAin 4-0464.

SUMMER HOME FOR RENT N. J.

STANHOPE, corner Sparta & Brooklyn Road; 4-5-7 rooms; improvements; furnished; Lake Musconetcong privileges; commuting; \$195 up. Reeves, 119 Lexington, Manhattan, ASHland 4-4570.

FOR RENT

114 St., 508 W.—Arizona, \$5 and up. Opposite Columbia, luxurious studios, house-keeping; 24-hour elevator, switch-board service; special monthly rates.

57th St., 44 W.—Exceptional opportunity, 1½ room studio apartment, 18 x 22, fireplace, quiet; \$36. Single person. CO 5-6479.

LANGUAGES

Bargain Phonograph Courses. All Makes. Mail Orders. Booklet N. LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

POSITION WANTED

"Lady under 35 desires position. Prefers teaching. Good appearances, M.A. English, University of Iowa 1940." Box 1343, c/o The Nation.

"ANGELS" WANTED

to help finish 25 years of work, developing evolutionary psychology as a new approach to social problems. I need a volunteer secretary, a bibliographer, money for printing and distributing among reference libraries one to ten books, whose outlook is too new and devastating for commercial publishers. Let me send a descriptive pamphlet to you.

THEODORE SCHROEDER COSCOB, CONN.

RECORDS

COLUMBIA gives us three works recorded by Stokowski with the American Youth Orchestra (whether last year's orchestra or this year's is not revealed): Beethoven's Fifth Symphony (Set 451, \$5.50), Brahms's Fourth Symphony (Set 452, \$6.50), and Stravinsky's "Firebird" Suite (Set 446, \$3.50). The few comments on these sets that I have seen have found Stokowski's handling of Beethoven and Brahms open to question but his handling of Stravinsky admirable, and have praised Columbia's recording of the performances. To me it seems that the fussy phrasing, the exaggerated nuances, the constant swelling and contracting of lush tone, all adding up to what I would call a heavily perfumed style, falsify the character of Stravinsky's *Ronde des princesses* and *Berceuse* no less than that of Beethoven's and Brahms's music. And on a high-fidelity phonograph the recorded sound of the *Ronde* (Side 2) is accompanied by rattle and grit; while that of the *Danse infernale* screams and screeches on top and is thin, hard, without body, depth and warmth in the middle and bass (I have never heard anything like the horrible noise produced by the beginning of Side 4). The sound of Beethoven's Fifth has more body—which means, I presume, better proportion of low and middle to high frequencies—but is cold and harsh on a high-fidelity machine. And even the Brahms, which is the best of the three in depth and roundness, lacks warmth and has another defect of Columbia recording—the false relations of space and volume exemplified by what happens in the second variation of the last-movement *passacaglia*: the oboe and clarinet which lead off, apparently at some distance from the microphone, are joined by other woodwinds that sound much closer.

There is no warmth, but only hard, clear, and occasionally piercing brilliance, as well as increases of sonority that blast one out of the room, in the best of Columbia's recent orchestral recordings—that of Rodzinski's taut performance of the "Rosenkavalier" waltzes with the Cleveland Orchestra (11542-D, \$1). Perhaps Columbia would achieve more if it attempted less—if it did not undertake to outdo what anyone else is doing in frequency- and volume-range, and tried merely to do as much as is

done on its superb imported Beecham records of "Carmen" and the "Haffner" Symphony and "Francesca da Rimini," or on Victor's imported Furtwängler records of the "Pathétique" Symphony "Tristan," and "Parsifal." I would be content if it achieved with Stokowski the clarity and fidelity, the depth and body and warmth of his first Victor recording (Set 53) of the "Firebird" Suite; and for that matter I would be content if Stokowski himself achieve the performance on those records of ten or twelve years ago, made before his style had developed its present elephantiasis.

The Columbia Stokowski recordings are more agreeable to the ear with the treble of a high-fidelity machine reduced, or on a small machine of reduced frequency-range that cuts off the high frequency harshness and grit as well as the high-frequency musical sound. One should reduce the treble also for Lotte Lehmann's records of Brahms songs (Set 453, \$4), which, played with wide range, produce rattle and growl along with admirably faithful sound of her voice. The songs include very good ones like "Wie bist du, meine Königin" (17273) and "Die Mainacht" (71060) and slight but charming ones like "Sonntag" and "O liebliche Wangen" (71060) and others that I don't care for like "Wir wandelten" (17273), "An der Nachtigall" and "Auf dem Kirchhofe" (17274), and three folksongs—"Erlaube mir, Feinsmädchen," "Da unten im Tale," and "Feinsliebchen, du sollst mir nicht barfuss gehen." The last of these Lehmann sings a little too archly and there are the occasional sharp intakes of breath; but on the whole the singing and phrasing are lovely.

I keep wishing for a recording of the fascinating "Dix pièces pittoresques" of Chabrier that Balanchine used for "Cotillon"; meanwhile Columbia offers one of the pieces, the Scherzo-Vals rattled off perfunctorily by Casadesu with a less interesting Impromptu of Chabrier on the reverse side of the record (71061-D, \$1). On another sing are three spirituals—"Lit'l Boy," "Want to Go Home," "You're Tired, Chile!"—which I find less impressive in themselves than in the way they are sung by Roland Hayes (17275-I, \$.75). And Roy Harris's String Quartet No. 3, well performed by the Roy Harris Quartet (Set 450, \$4.50), is some more of this composer's windy incoherence to express the Oklahoma plains and character (is there no Oklahoman to protest?).

B. H. HAGGIN

Letters to the Editors

Production Comes First

Dear Sirs: I have been pleased to note in these last critical months that *The Nation* has taken a realistic attitude toward world events, but I am somewhat up in the air after reading the editorial *The Coming Labor Crisis* in the June 7 issue.

I am in the A. F. of L.—or was until the Typographical Union stepped out—and a Socialist. I naturally believe in the right to strike. But I also believe that right should be suspended in times of national danger. Fully appreciating that living costs are rising and that big employers never grant just and proper wages voluntarily, I nevertheless believe some machinery should be set up by our national government very soon to effect all-out war-time production. Strikes seriously hamper such production. Industry certainly contributes more than its share to the *casus belli* in strikes. Both industry and labor, therefore, should be made to toe the line.

I am not acquainted with all the provisions of the Vinson compulsory-labor-mediation bill, but I believe compulsory mediation of some sort, with a federal body fixing wages and working conditions in an industry where a labor dispute exists, is the answer *today*. Such a body would not order a "cooling-off" period before strikes but would step in immediately, keep up production, and make all its orders retroactive from the time the dispute started. Labor and industry would have to abide by its decisions.

This may seem heresy for a man in the labor movement, but I am also an American who looks with horror at the bloody shambles in Europe and sees nothing but slavery for labor throughout the world should Hitler win.

ARTHUR P. WIESNER

Milwaukee, Wis., June 20

One Way to Fight Inflation

Dear Sirs: I was interested in reading the article *Luxury or Liberty?* by Maxwell S. Stewart, in your issue of May 24. He is undoubtedly right in pointing out the danger of inflation arising from an increase in the national income without a corresponding increase in the consumers' goods available for purchase. Likewise, he is right when he says that

the best way to avoid that danger "is to attack purchasing power directly." As methods for effective attack he cites these three: "taxation, compulsory savings, and restrictions on consumers' credit."

It seems to me that there is a fourth method from which great results can be hoped. I refer to the Defense Savings Bond and Stamp Program inaugurated by the government on May 1. This, of course, contains no elements of compulsion, but it does have in it psychological appeals which may be expected to enlist many millions of our people as partners in the American effort. In May it resulted in purchases of these securities amounting in round figures to \$442,000,000. The public willingness to take part continues unabated, and it is not unlikely that within a twelve-month several billion dollars will have been put in these securities.

This represents a substantial subtraction from the people's income spendable on consumers' goods and is, in my judgment, one of the most effective preventives of inflation that we have. In essence, it is an American modification, on a basis of free will rather than duress, of the Keynes plan. I think it deserves inclusion as one of the best methods of attacking purchasing power directly.

GEORGE FORT MILTON

Washington, June 19

And One Way to Cause It

Dear Sirs: I recently subscribed to *The Nation* with high hopes for the chance to read an intelligent, pro-American, pro-civilization journal. But I soon began to suspect that your pro-Americanism was second to your pro-labor policy, and all doubt is removed by reading your editorial *The Coming Labor Crisis*, in the issue of June 7. You say, "Powerful interests have sought . . . to give the impression that the defense program was being seriously retarded by strikes and labor disputes," which you would have us believe is altogether absurd. And you lament that "the gains which labor has won . . . at great sacrifice during the last few months stand in grave danger of being wiped out by the increased cost of living. . . . These workers will have no recourse except to strike or to threaten to strike." Such a position is not even intelligently pro-labor. For

the inflationary spiral which such a policy would inaugurate would engulf labor along with everyone else.

R. L. EDWARDS

Oxford, Ohio, June 18

Vichy's Catholicism

Dear Sirs: In my review of Jacques Maritain's book, "France, My Country, Through the Disaster," I referred to the military castes of France and Spain, leaders in the betrayal of their peoples, as "devout Catholics." Good Catholic friends have written to me that I was wrong. Weygand and Huntziger, they assure me, are practicing Catholics, and so are most of the Spanish counter-revolutionaries, beginning with Generalissimo Franco, but Admiral Darlan was a *franc-maçon*, who gave up his Masonic affiliations only in order to enter Pétain's government. Pétain, moreover, it appears, "made career with the anti-clerical clan of the army" and, having married a divorced woman, was outside the discipline of the church until recently, when the death of his wife's former husband enabled him to make his peace with Rome. This, my correspondents remind me, is scarcely the behavior of a "devout Catholic."

For the sake of accuracy, these details should be noted. But of course they do not weaken my point about the religion of the people of France, or my regret that M. Maritain did not bring to bear upon this crucial weakness the critical clairvoyance of his love.

WALDO FRANK

New York, June 20

A Labor Policy for Defense

Dear Sirs: In the hysteria that has been aroused recently in regard to American labor and the defense program, constructive thinking has been almost totally lacking. It will interest your readers to know, therefore, that the executive committee of the Union for Democratic Action, composed of educators, labor leaders, and qualified writers on social problems, sat down quietly and worked out a statement of policy which has as its purpose the defense of democracy at home and abroad. The statement follows:

The Union for Democratic Action congratulates the Congress of Industrial Organizations (C. I. O.) for its action against the

wild-cat strike in the Los Angeles plant of the North American Aviation Company. This strike was clearly provoked and led by Communists who exploited the legitimate demands of the strikers for sinister political ends. The attitude of responsible leaders of the C. I. O. is a splendid expression of labor's determination to allow no subversive elements to interfere with production for national defense. The North American plant should be released from army control as soon as normal union-management collective-bargaining relations are restored.

We strongly urge that a limit be set on the discretion allowed local draft boards in decisions to reclassify defense workers participating in strikes. Unlimited use of the Selective Service Act as a strike-breaking weapon would result in a severe loss of labor gains throughout the country.

We believe that the right to strike represents a basic democratic freedom. But in its own interest, as well as in the interest of national defense and democracy, labor should make every effort to avoid strikes by making full use of all conciliation and mediation sources. Strikes can be avoided (1) if labor unions eliminate from their leadership all those who take an irresponsible attitude toward production for national defense and democracy, whether because they owe allegiance to a foreign government, communist or fascist, or because they are merely defeatist; (2) if labor voluntarily outlaws strikes based upon jurisdictional disputes of any kind; (3) if government boards of mediation are so set up that the trade unions have full representation upon them; (4) if adequate machinery is set up to make necessary adjustments in wages in organized and unorganized industries to meet the rising cost of living, and if a determined effort is made by the government to *prevent* rising living costs; (5) if there is no interference, either from management or government, with efforts to form unions among unorganized workers in accordance with the law; (6) if all legislation to prohibit the right to strike is defeated. Prohibition of the right to strike is as dangerous as infringement of the right to vote. Destruction of union rights and power is the beginning of totalitarianism.

The Union for Democratic Action believes that industrial peace is necessary for national defense against fascism. But industrial peace is a cooperative job of labor unions, management, and government. It calls for cooperation between unions and management. It requires the uprooting of subversive elements in both business and labor. It calls for severe taxation of excess profits; so that labor, the middle class, and farmers may have the assurance that any sacrifices that are made will not redound to the benefit of the owners of industry.

Responsible labor leaders and the rank and file of labor are determined to get full protection. But it must be noted that since last summer infinitely more production has been lost from the "business as usual" attitude of the administrators of industry than from

strikes. There was a sitdown strike of corporations last summer, when they refused to take national defense orders until they secured satisfactory amortization and taxation concessions from the government. Shortages of steel, aluminum, magnesium, and electric power threaten defense production because monopoly interests refused to expand their capacity to produce. The refusal of monopoly corporations to subcontract defense orders among smaller enterprises is even now creating bottlenecks and making it impossible to get full use of our economic resources for defense.

Hence the Union for Democratic Action calls for the grant of full powers to the President to take over any productive property that is needed for national defense. Specifically we ask that the President be granted the power to (1) seize any plant not doing its job for defense; (2) seize needed machine tools now being withheld from defense work; (3) force any enterprise sticking to civilian production for higher profits to go into defense work; (4) seize strategic materials now being hoarded in many industries by "forward buying."

JAMES LOEB, JR., Executive Secretary
New York, June 20

Liberals and the War

Dear Sirs: Stanley High's attempt to show that war economy will be directed by liberal statesmen to the ultimate advantage of labor in America and Britain is an insult to the intelligence of those who read the columns of *The Nation*. The claim that this is a "little people's" war because the little people do all the suffering marks a new low in liberal journalism. If Britain and America do emerge from the war militarily victorious with the present leadership, people like Stanley High will be profoundly disappointed with the "liberal" millennium.

This is not, however, to confirm the Communist thesis that genuine liberals have no business supporting the war; for the Communists would seem to be liable to a similar charge—namely, of abetting in spite of themselves an equally immoral group of imperialists and potential fascists—the Lindberghs, Fords, Hugh Johnsons, McCormicks *et al.* of the "Western Hemisphere school." It must be said at least to the Communists' credit that they have been astute in discerning the character of their bedfellows, while a number of liberals apparently have not. But if the Communists insist that their particular version of isolationism is a *third* program to be distinguished sharply from that of the America First Committee, it would seem that the liberals have the same right to make distinctions between the

liberal pro-war program and that of the present interventionist clique. To fail to avail oneself of this privilege of logic and to identify the liberal cause with the cause of a Churchill, a Halifax, a Knudsen, or a Stettinius is indicative of a spurious conception of liberalism.

There is justification for a choice—if reluctant—in favor of the cause of tory democracy as against the cause of equally tory Western Hemisphere imperialism, but there is no justification for glozing the facts.

LELAND THIELEMANN
Newark, N. J., June 18

CONTRIBUTORS

LOUIS FISCHER, for many years *The Nation's* Moscow correspondent, is the author of the current best-seller "Men and Politics."

NORMAN ANGELL won the Nobel peace prize in 1933. He is the author of "The Great Illusion," "Why Freedom Matters," and other books.

PHILIP MURRAY is the president of the Congress of Industrial Organizations.

PETER STEVENS is the pseudonym of an American writer who has just returned from a year's stay in the Near East.

DONALD W. MITCHELL has for twenty years been a close student of naval and military history. He recently completed a book dealing with defense problems of the United States.

HERBERT ROSINSKI, distinguished authority on European affairs, is now associated with the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton University.

W. H. AUDEN, English poet and critic, is at present in this country. His latest volume of verse is "The Double Man."

ROSE M. STEIN, a regular contributor to *The Nation*, is now doing labor research in Washington.

DOROTHY VAN DOREN, formerly associate editor of *The Nation*, is the author of "Those First Affections" and other books.

INFORMATION FOR SUBSCRIBERS
THE NATION, 55 Fifth Ave., New York. Price 15 cents a copy. By subscription—Domestic: One year \$5; Two years \$8; Three years \$11. Additional Postage per year: Foreign, \$1; Canadian, \$1. The Nation is indexed in Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature, Book Review Digest, Index to Labor Articles, Public Affairs Information Service, Dramatic Index. Two weeks' notice and the old address as well as the new are required for change of address.